THEORETICAL AND DISCUSSION JOURNAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

SEPTEMBER 1961

Marxism Today

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

ANDREW ROTHSTEIN — THE PROGRAMME FOR BUILDING COMMUNIST SOCIETY

LEONARD THOMAS — BRITAIN'S ECONOMY AND THE COMMON MARKET

JOHN TARVER — THE FUTURE OF BRITISH SPORT

BILL PINDER — TRADE UNIONS AND COLOURED WORKERS

DISCUSSION:
JACK DUNMAN — ON CAPITALISM'S ECONOMIC PROSPECTS

JACK LINDSAY — ON STAGES OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Monthly 1/6

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism Today

Vol. 5 **No. 9**

CONTENTS

		page
	Editorial Comments	257
Andrew ROTHSTEIN	**The Programme for Building Communist Society** ... ... Analysis of the development from the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848 to the 1961 Draft Programme of the C.P.S.U.	261
Leonard THOMAS	**Britain's Economy and the Common Market** ... ... Examines the causes of Britain's economic difficulties and the results of joining the Common Market	270
John TARVER	**The Future of British Sport** ... Discusses the Wolfenden Report on Sport, and sets out the Communist Party's proposals.	275
Bill PINDER	**Trade Unions and Coloured Workers** ... ... Discusses the attitude of trade unionists to coloured workers and the causes of racial prejudice.	282
DISCUSSION: Jack DUNMAN	**On Capitalism's Economic Prospects**	286
Jack LINDSAY	**On Stages of Social Development**	288

Editor John Gollan

Assistant Editor
James Klugmann

Editorial Board

Professor J. D Bernal
Emile Burns
Gabriel Carritt
Maurice Cornforth
Maurice Dobb
Jack Hendy
Arnold Kettle
John Lewis
Frank McKenna
John Mahon
Alan Morton
Frank Stanley
Professor George Thomson

Editorial correspondence
James Klugmann
16 King Street, W.C.2.

Advertisements
Margaret Williamson,
above address.

Orders and Subscriptions
usual agents or
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Grays Inn Road,
London, W.C.1.

Subscription rates
Six issues 10s. 6d.
Twelve issues 21s.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial Comments

PEOPLE discussing the exceedingly sharp change in the international economic position of Britain are only too apt to blame the British workers, who, we are told, have pushed up wages so rapidly that British exports can no longer be sold in the world market. *Now this is simply untrue.* British exports have not been expanding as fast as the exports of other European countries, but they have been expanding. In the years 1958-60 British exports were 29 per cent larger than they were in the years 1952-54. In the Overseas Sterling Area they were up by 12 per cent; in Western Europe by 32 per cent; in North America by 79 per cent and in the rest of the world by 44 per cent. Not a brilliant performance but, nevertheless, a fair average performance. Contrary to general belief, exports of goods have not been falling in the recent period. In the first half of 1960 British exports were £300 million per month; in the first quarter of 1961 they were £309 million. No collapse here.

The terrific collapse in the recent period has been in the so-called invisible earnings, that is the income derived from British investments overseas and from earnings of British shipping and other services. In the early 1950's the surplus of earnings from these sources was £300 million per year. In the last year (1960) this tremendous surplus had fallen to £22 million per year. Let us take shipping. Until recently the income received from selling British shipping space to foreigners enormously exceeded the payments to foreigners for the use of their shipping. Up till two years ago it was simply inconceivable that Britain, the chief ship-building and shipping nation of the world, should be paying foreigners more for the use of *their* shipping than they were paying us for the use of *our* shipping. But the inconceivable has happened. In 1958 we got £637 million from foreigners for the use of British shipping facilities and paid out £615 million for the use of their facilities. In 1960 the British capitalist economy got £644 million for selling British shipping facilities to foreigners and paid out £669 million for the use of foreign shipping facilities. This is a new and startling situation—a situation which, in the hundred years between 1850 and 1950, would have sent any businessman, or economist, climbing the walls in sheer rage or despair.

In 1958 the British capitalist economy received £676 million from its foreign investments and paid out to other capitalist countries the sum of £415 million, leaving the comfortable surplus of £261 million. In 1960 it received £634 million—£42 million less than in 1958, and paid out £455 million—£40 million more than in 1958. So its surplus sank to £179 million. It looks as if the British capitalist economy, which in its heyday used to prey upon the world, is now being preyed upon by other capitalist powers—with the U.S. at their head—to an increasing extent.

And one item has grown enormously. Before the war Government overseas military expenditure was about £16 million. In the 1950's it rose to £150 million. In 1960 it was £215 million.

So Britain's difficulties today are not mainly due to the inability of British industry to sell goods abroad. In fact if British exports are not expanding as fast as those of some of its competitors, they are *still* expanding.

The main reasons for the deterioration are that the British shipping industry is losing vast amounts of trade to foreign shipping companies, that foreign firms, governments and individuals with investments in Britain are drawing an ever-increasing amount of interest, profits and dividends from the British economy, and that *British imperialism is spending an ever-increasing amount of its resources on overseas military expenditure.*

It is hardly fair to blame either the British workers, or their unions for this considerable deterioration.

Embargoes Self-imposed

Few people realise the extent to which the British Government is still maintaining an embargo on the export of certain types of goods to China, the Soviet Union and to socialist countries generally. Yet no less than fourteen pages of the *Board of Trade Journal* (11.8.61) were occupied by a consolidated list of goods subject to an embargo.

There is, of course, a list of munitions and of materials and equipment connected with atomic energy. What these embargoes are intended to accomplish we are not told. Most people will accept as a fact that the Soviet Union can make quite a lot of munitions and atomic energy without British assistance.

We find, however, fairly large lists of items under the headings of metal-working machinery, chemical and petroleum equipment, electrical and power generating equipment, general industrial equipment, transportation equipment, electronic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equipment, including communication and radar (this is easily the largest list), scientific instruments and apparatus, servo-mechanisms and photographic equipment, chemicals, metalloids and petroleum products.

When we read this list we see very clearly that nearly every manufactured product which British companies could expertly produce is on the banned list. Exporters have to humbly request a licence to be allowed to sell the best products of British industry to a socialist country. This at a time when the government pretends to be anxious to promote British exports.

Television Trends

Naturally enough, the press in Britain stressed the winning by the B.B.C. of the "Golden Rose" award at the Montreux International Television Festival in a field of thirty-four entries, submitted by twenty-four networks. George Inn's *Black and White Minstrel Show,* the winner, is something that readers and viewers recognise, while the other affairs of the Festival can be dismissed as mystique, that is the sole province of the "boffins" of television. Actually, the Montreux Festival, the first of its kind, combined the "Golden Rose" TV Contest, with an exhibition of television studio equipment, as well as an international television symposium attended by scientists, engineers, executives representing most of the world's TV organisations, and one TV Trade Unionist—Jim Smith, vice-president of the Association of Cinematograph, Television and Allied Technicians (from Britain).

Mr. Smith, in his union's journal (*Film & Television Technician,* July 1961), comments that both the exhibition and the symposium "were dominated by the Americans and Japanese and provided something of a publicity scoop for these companies". He regretted that no British manufacturer took the opportunity to show their latest equipment, and warned that British organisations would do well to note the Festival's importance. This is underlined by the announcement of Mr. Melville Mark, Festival Director, in July that the exhibition produced sales of television equipment estimated at some £3 million. "About two-thirds," added Mr. Mark, "of this total represents electronic equipment sold by American exhibitors."

Television is not today the prerogative of those countries that refer to the others as "underdeveloped". Of course, there are contrasts, and Jim Smith reported some of the statistics given by Mr. Herbert Evans, general manager of the People's Broadcasting Corporation of America: the national average viewing time in the U.S.A. was 5.6 hours per day, 96 per cent of the homes were fitted with TV and 13 per cent of them had more than one set; the industry there was now concentrating on the sales of portable and car sets. Alongside these facts, Mr. Gabriel Tedros, of Addis Ababa, stated in a paper that, of the 120,000 TV receivers in Africa, 100,000 were in the United Arab Republic, where there were thirteen transmitters covering 75 per cent of the population with one channel operating twelve hours a day exclusively on educational programmes. The U.A.R. Government provided a special hire purchase scheme to enable people to buy receivers which were partly assembled and manufactured in the country. It was also reported that in Asia as well as in Africa a major problem was the lack of mains electricity supply; Japan had produced many battery sets to fill this need. The exchange of such information at Montreux has shown the opportunities presented to the richer, more technologically advanced manufacturing nations to extend their sales abroad, and this is, no doubt, a contributory reason why a second International Television Festival is to be held in Montreux next April and May.

The Festival Director has announced that this year's Symposium was the largest such conference ever held in Europe, with some 400 specialists from thirty-two countries attending the forum.

TV from Aircraft?

Among the many developments discussed at the Montreux Festival were the possibilities of the daily exchange of news items via Eurovision, and the experiments in the United States for relaying educational TV programmes from aircraft. In regard to the former, the main problem today was to be able to find enough high quality sound circuits to carry all the different languages used in commentaries on the same news event; sometimes, reported Jim Smith, of the A.C.T.T., there were as many as ten, and it is planned to solve this problem by the use of radio links. At a fixed time each day each country would feed in its news items via Brussels for recording by other countries and re-use in the evening news bulletins. In the American educational TV experiment a plane, fitted with tape recording machines, circles at 23,000 feet to give an estimated coverage of 13,000 schools with half a million students. While one does not wish to see a sword in every ploughshare, one can well imagine the military and civil defence aspects of such a scheme, as the entire U.S.A. could be covered by twenty such flying stations. Technological advances in TV—and further developments now just glimpsed on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

horizon—with their ability to reach a whole continent simultaneously, give the controllers of this medium untold power and influence.

Obvious as that may now seem, it was not so clear to all some ten or twelve years ago, when the advent of commercial TV was being arranged. Now that most bodies have put in some evidence to the Pilkington Committee, backward glances are the order of the day; the drafters of evidence to Pilkington are wondering whether they have done their homework properly, and are asking themselves: "How did it go last time?"

Why, for instance, was the ruling class split between the advocates of commercial TV and the supporters of the B.B.C.? In those days the possibility of the Labour Government really taking control were not so remote—at least, so thought those who wanted private industry to control a channel of TV communication, in case the public B.B.C. really was controlled by the public of a Labour Government. Those who backed the B.B.C. must secretly have known and "trusted" the Labour leaders to play the Establishment game. The Montreux International Festival shows that the problem is no longer confined to being a national one.

Unemployment in America

Those who believe that capitalism has more or less achieved full employment should have a close look at what is happening to the American economy today. It has climbed out of the recent recession and has reached record production figures, but no less than 6.9 per cent of the labour force, or 5,140,000 workers, are unemployed. The number of those who are out of work for more than fifteen weeks has climbed to 1,634,000 and over a million of those have not seen a pay packet for six months.

The older workers, as befits an economy where "the rate race" is encouraged, suffer most from the long-term unemployment.

No less than 36 per cent of those out of work, who are over forty-five years of age, have been out of work for fifteen weeks or more, against 28 per cent amongst the eighteen to twenty-four age-group. "What is particularly worrying for the authorities is that in boom, as in recession, the proportion of prolonged unemployment to the total is steadily creeping upwards," says *The Economist* (12.8.61).

A feature of U.S. unemployment is its steady growth amongst white-collar workers in the service industries and in finance. There has been some havering amongst right-wing Labour people that the growth in the number of such people, in capitalist industry everywhere, is a factor making for social conservation. Evidently the development of automation in offices in the U.S. is leaving such people very little to be conservative about.

Throughout the whole post-war period, there has been a very steady build-up of modern productive capacity in the U.S. It may be for that reason that it is very difficult for the U.S. to get into a sustained boom based on the installation of new plant, buildings and machinery. Hence all upsurgings tend to be short-lived, and each fails to an increasing extent to absorb the unemployed, a point that was made in the recent document of the Economic Sub-Committee of the Communist Party. It is also clear in both upswing and downswing that automation is beginning to create large-scale redundancy.

Away from Sex?

The American show business weekly, *Variety*, has recently been reporting a swing away from extreme-sex themes in cinema films towards comedy. No single reason is held to be responsible, but alarm at both public outcry and bluestocking pressure groups attacks on "overly erotic stuff," as Jack Pitman puts it (*Variety*, 5.7.61), as well as the success of both cheaply made British comedies with no important stars in them and star-studded American comedies such as *Some Like it Hot*, are regarded as major factors in the change. After the exploitation of some unhealthy aspects of sex in Hollywood movies, news of some American censorship is liable to raise the cry of "Hypocrite!" In an advertisement for the British *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* in the *Los Angeles Times* a black t-shirt was painted over Albert Finney, and Rachel Roberts was almost entirely screened out in neutral grey. (The film was condemned by the Catholic Legion of Decency). The future of the human species is not in danger of annihilation from a surfeit of sexless pictures, as the titles of some of Universal's coming attractions indicate—*Lover Come Back* and *Touch of Mink*, for example. While the often absurd actions of official and self-styled censors hit the headlines and cause difficulties for film-makers, it is largely the deeper, more balanced dislike by audiences of the amoral and the immoral that has caused the swing; equally, many of the comedies from both Hollywood and Britain have shown a healthy, if not intellectual, state of mind on the part of their sponsors with a humanist approach apparent every now and then. Supremely conscious of falling box-office, the producers have been quick to see the way ahead.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Theatre Crisis in the U.S.A.

We have several times written in these comments on the progress in the British theatre and also on the fight for a National Theatre. There is an interesting review in the progressive American journal *Mainstream* on the prevailing crisis in the theatre in the U.S.A.

It seems that the Dramatists' Guild seriously proposed a couple of months ago that playwrights should accept voluntary cuts in their royalties as a means of propping up the ailing theatre. Such proposals have been made on previous occasions but, this time, the playwrights themselves—some 470 of them—voted overwhelmingly to accept the proposal, and called upon actors, theatre-owners and technicians to follow suit.

How is it possible, asks *Mainstream*, that the American theatre should be brought to such a pass, precisely at a moment when the average theatre-goer is living "in plushier apartments, with bigger expense accounts and more highly inflated salaries than in his entire history?"

It is possible, they replied, that what the facts are crying out aloud is that the theatre cannot depend upon the thin slice of the population which at the present moment goes to the theatre, a section of the population whose interests, problems, ideas, likes and dislikes, are far too unrepresentative of the mass of the population, as their incomes are far greater and, therefore, far too remote from the real concerns of the people.

It is pointless, they point out, to call on the people to support the theatre for its own sake. The theatre must serve the people; the people must find something important and useful in it for them. If the theatre ignores *their* problems *they* will ignore the theatre. There is much evidence, *Mainstream* points out, that in history the theatre has flourished when it reflected the hopes of the people and the issues of the times. This is shown, for instance, by the W.P.A. theatre, which is the only theatre in American history that came close to the people, and even became, for a time, the voice of the people.

It is, perhaps, ironical that when the theatre confines itself to the problems of the middle class it ends up by boring the very section of the population whose point of view it aspires to reflect. With few exceptions, Broadway has stood aside from the struggles of our times or has joined "the dismal carriers of despair, cynicism, 'conservatism', mysticism, and it has paid the price". *Mainstream* concludes that accepting royalty cuts will never save the theatre. For, even if the theatre were free, it would still play to half-empty seats as long as its contents remain empty.

"The fight for an audience cannot be separated from the fight for a new content in what the theatre has to say."

The World Takes Fire

We have often commented in these columns on the useful work done by our French colleague, *Recherches Internationales*, which prints what is not original material, but selections of the writings of contemporary Marxists, in special numbers on specific subjects. They have now published a special double number under the title of *1938-1941: The World Takes Fire*. This contains a whole number of most interesting studies on the immediate pre-war period and on the first years of the Second World War. It includes articles on the Munich Agreement, the fascisation of Czechoslovakia, the German monopolists in Spain in 1938-39, the British-French-Soviet negotiations of 1939 and the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact, the preparations for the Hitlerian aggression on the Soviet Union.

Once again we take pleasure in strongly recommended this publication, which can be obtained through Central Books, Collet's or, by order, from other booksellers.

Political Africa

A useful contribution to the understanding of developments in Africa has been made by Ronald Segal in *Political Africa: A Who's Who of Personalities and Parties* (Stevens and Sons Ltd. 50s.). As the author notes in his preface, rapid changes in the African political scene, coupled with difficulties in obtaining information, have made the compilation of this book extremely difficult; but the result is a valuable work of reference on persons and political organisations in all parts of Africa.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Programme for Building Communist Society

Andrew Rothstein

First Programme of Communism

IN 1848 Marx and Engels laid the foundations of modern, or scientific, communism in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. By far the greater part of this unique document was devoted to analysis of the part played by capitalism and the capitalist class in world history, the position of the proletariat and its mission as "gravedigger" of the bourgeoisie, the historic aims of Communists in the most general sense, and their attitude to the various other schools of thought and parties competing for the allegiance of the working class. Barely one page out of thirty-six in the latest English edition deals with what the proletariat will do when it raises itself to the position of ruling class.

Here occurs the famous passage which until November 1917, seemed a remote ideal, despite the foundation in after years of political parties of the working class by men and women who had accepted the principles of the *Manifesto*.

"The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest by degrees all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i.e. of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible." And then followed ten points—"despotic inroads on the rights of property and on the conditions of bourgeois production"—which would constitute the programme of action of such a state. The reader can look them up (with advantage) in the *Manifesto*.

So remote was the ideal, indeed, that all the programmes of the legally functioning parties formed between 1869 and 1900 had dropped them by the end of the century, and were concentrating entirely on winning political and social reforms. As the great Italian Marxist Antonio Labriola was already writing in 1895, in his *In Memory of the Communist Manifesto*: "Not one of these parties feels the dictatorship of the proletariat so near that it experiences the need or desire or even the temptation to examine anew and pass judgment upon the measures proposed in the *Manifesto*."

Even more remote, therefore, seemed the vista which the authors of the *Communist Manifesto* saw opening *beyond* the dictatorship of the proletariat and its reorganisation of production after taking the means thereof away from the bourgeoisie —"when, in the course of development, class distinctions have been abolished and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation". Then, in place of the old bourgeois society with its classes and class antagonisms, "we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all".

This itself, by the way, was the summary of a passage in Engels' draft of the *Manifesto*—a kind of catechism which he entitled *The Principles of Communism*. In reply to the question, what will be the consequences of the final abolition of private property, Engels replied:

> "The universal association of all members of society for the joint and planned exploitation of the productive forces and the expansion of production to the point at which it will satisfy the requirements of all: the end of the condition in which the requirements of some are satisfied at the expense of others: the complete abolition of classes and of contradictions between them: the all-round development of the capacities of all members of society by abolition of the division of labour hitherto in existence, by industrial education, by alternation of activities, by the participation of all in the wealth produced by all, and by the fusion of town and country."

All this was very far from the strictly practical series of demands for political, economic and social improvements in the condition of the working class in particular, and the working part of the nation in general, on which the "legal" Socialist parties at the beginning of the twentieth century were fighting elections, conducting great campaigns in factory and street, local councils and Parliament, and helping to build powerful trade unions, co-operatives, women's and other mass movements. This was inevitable in the period from 1871 to 1914; Lenin wrote in April 1917: "History made slow organisational and educational work the task of the day. Nothing else was possible." And the gradual penetration of Liberal ideas—revisionism—into their ranks at the turn of the century, as imperialism developed, took the Socialist parties still further from the *Communist Manifesto*.

The Russian Social-Democrats in 1903

But there was one Socialist party which constituted an exception—the illegal, "underground", Russian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Social-Democratic Labour Party. At their second congress (in London) in 1903, they adopted a programme which came nearer to the essential ideas of the *Manifesto*. Like the programmes of the French Workers' Party (1880), the German Social-Democratic Party (1891), the Italian Socialist Party (1892) and others, it included a series of immediate demands suited to Russia's special circumstances—for detailed reforms in the sphere of political liberty, workers' rights and peasants' conditions, which would bring relief at once to the mass of the people and destroy the semi-feudal power of the landowners. But their fulfilment (unlike the demands in other socialist programmes) depended upon a revolutionary act—"the overthrow of Tsarist autocracy and its replacement by a democratic republic"—since the barbarous traces of pre-capitalist society which Tsardom ("the most powerful bulwark of all this barbarism") defended were a very potent obstacle to economic progress and to the full development of the class struggle of the proletariat.

Like the programmes of the larger legal parties in other countries, it proclaimed the ultimate mission of the proletariat. "Having replaced private property in the means of production and circulation by social property, and introducing the planned organisation of the process of social production to ensure the welfare and all-round development of all members of society, the social revolution of the proletariat will abolish the division of society into classes and thereby liberate all oppressed humanity, since it will put an end to all varieties of exploitation of one part of society by another." But unlike the other parties, it stated in plain and blunt terms that "the necessary condition of this social revolution is the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e. conquest by the proletariat of such political power as will enable it to suppress all resistance by the exploiters".

It was Lenin who, in the preliminary discussions of the draft programme, insisted on this specific distinction between the period of rule by the working class and the ultimate achievement of a classless society—as Marx and Engels had done (as a glance at sections 1 and 2 of *What Is To Be Done?* published in 1902, and the reports of his speeches at the Congress given in the first pages of Volume VI of his *Collected Works*, now happily beginning to be available, will show). It was Lenin, too, who, beginning with the split virtually into two parties at that Congress, led the way over the years between 1903 and 1917 in building up the Bolshevik party as one which explicitly proclaimed its aim to be, first, the revolutionary overthrow of Tsardom and the establishment of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, and secondly, development of the latter into the dictatorship of the proletariat. The special circumstances of Tsarist Russia made it possible to carry out both these revolutions in one year—1917. On November 7th that year the dictatorship of the proletariat "organised as the ruling class" was established in Russia. The practical points of the 1903 programme began to be rapidly put into effect, so far as war conditions allowed. One decisive landmark, fixed both by that programme and by the 1848 *Manifesto*, was thus passed.

Fulfilment—and a New Programme

Now began the fulfilment of the ten points for "entirely revolutionising the mode of production" which Marx and Engels had found "pretty generally applicable", once the proletariat by a revolution had made itself the ruling class—and which Labriola had thought so far away. A new programme was needed.

As soon as he arrived back from exile in April, that year, Lenin had in his famous *Theses on the Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution* raised the question of amending the programme—on the questions of imperialism (the highest and final stage of capitalism, which was only beginning in 1903), of the state (the Party should now demand one similar in type to the Paris Commune—the dictatorship of the proletariat), and of a new minimum statement of immediate aims (since that of 1903 would soon be out of date). In his book, *The State and Revolution*, written in August 1917, but not published until early in 1918, Lenin developed the Marxist theory of the new kind of state as it had never been developed before. In the course of it, he reminded the international working-class movement that over forty years before Marx had drawn a clear distinction between the lower phase of communism—socialism, to build which the dictatorship of the proletariat was necessary—and its higher phase, which must develop on the basis of socialism itself.

But in discussions on the new programme, after the October Revolution, Lenin would not accept suggestions that it should throw out the old passages characterising capitalism and instead give a picture of developed socialist society. He had to defend this attitude energetically against Bukharin and others at the Seventh Party Congress in March 1918. Capitalism still existed: imperialism, its new phase, was but its "superstructure": as for Russia, they were still "at the first transitional stage from capitalism to socialism", and how many stages there still lay ahead, they did not know. For the same reason he would not hear of "characterising socialist society in its developed form, i.e. communism": they didn't know what it would look like: "the bricks have not yet been made out of which socialism will form itself": moreover, it would be introduced by the mass efforts of millions of people out of their own experience. The really new and essential thing was to show the workers in Russia and abroad what the new type of state they had created was, what it was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aiming to do—and this should occupy "the outstanding place in the programme". It would continue the work which the Paris Commune in 1871 barely had time to begin. He submitted a full scheme for this section, *Ten Theses on the Soviet Power* (printed in Volume VIII of the old twelve-volume *Selected Works*). This was adopted.

In March 1919, the new programme based on Lenin's draft was submitted to the Eighth Party Congress. For the first time in world history the international working-class movement received a plain and understandable document which explained on a scientific foundation, as Lenin put it, "how the Communist revolution arose, why it was inevitable, what is its significance, its essence, its strength and what it has to decide". Up till then they had brought up the party of the proletariat on Marxist principles: now they had, said Lenin, to train tens of millions of working people to rule the first country where the capitalists had been driven from power. The new programme retained the analysis of capitalist society in the preamble of the old programme, expanding it, as Lenin recommended, to take in the age of imperialism and the shameful part of the "bourgeois distortions of socialism which had been victorious among the leaders of the official Social-Democratic and Socialist parties". But its chief section, covering many pages, dealt "more concretely with the tasks of proletarian dictatorship as applied to Russia"—relations between the classes and with foreign countries, relations between nationalities, military and judicial policy, education, religion, economic affairs, agriculture, distribution, currency and banking, finance, housing, labour welfare, health (the text was published in this country by the Workers' Socialist Federation in 1920).

In drawing it up, the Russian Communists had as guide the "ten points" of 1848, the struggles of the working class in many countries since Marx and Engels had passed away and "the practical experience of taking the first steps for the destruction of capitalism in a country with a special relationship of the proletariat and the peasantry", in Lenin's words. Capitalist and even pre-capitalist conditions abounded inside Russia itself. Moreover, it was a time when the imperialist great powers who had defeated Germany and Austra-Hungary were in arms against the Soviet Republic, invading its territory and blockading it, and their Russian puppet armies were threatening Moscow and Leningrad. The Soviet people were hungry, ragged, cold, without elementary comforts, attacked by vast epidemics. To any but convinced Socialists the vast series of constructive activities which the programme outlined could well seem as fantastic as the aim of overthrowing Tsardom, which the delegates of two or three thousand underground revolutionaries had set themselves in 1903, meeting in a little hall in London, far from their own country. And plenty of capitalist pronouncements could be found which bear this out.

1919-1961

Yet the first programme had been carried out—and the second has been, too. The aims set forth in it are a living reality in the Soviet Union today. Soviet citizens have for years past been living in a socialist society, in which the exploitation of man by man has long been only a memory: the means of production—all owned by society—have become a means of planned expansion of the nation's wealth, and the welfare of its citizens, at a speed without precedent in history: the workers and the peasants have become closely allied socialist classes, completely in control of their country: nationalities large and small are equal in practice in their economy and their opportunities: age-old distinctions between workers by hand and brain, between the position of men and women in society, between cultural opportunities in town and country, have disappeared or are disappearing: the people themselves are increasingly managing public affairs, side by side with their elected representatives. When such a time arrived, Lenin said at the 1919 Congress, "we shall draw up another programme".

This new step is indeed an objective necessity. For the stage has been reached of which Marx in 1875 wrote in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, when communist society has left far behind the condition in which it had just emerged from capitalist society, "still stamped with the birth-marks of the old society from whose womb it emerges", and is beginning to develop "on its own foundations". In the old society, the programme of the Communists laid chief emphasis on ways of mobilising the working class to overthow Tsardom: when that was done, emphasis shifted to the ways of building socialism: with its triumphant establishment, the sights have to be raised again—to completing the foundations of communism and the advance into full communist society.

This is not to say that, any more than its predecessors, the new programme takes leave of world realities—and this has caused visible annoyance to the hostile critics in the capitalist press. "Once more we have an analysis of the world scene in strictly Marxist-Leninist language, the old struggle between the powers of light and the powers of darkness. The capitalist world is still seen as a prey to contradictions," writes the reviewer in *The Times* (July 31st). The programme "will disappoint those who expected it to reflect the profound changes that have taken place in the world since the last programme was drawn up in 1919," said the leading article in the *Daily Telegraph*, the same day. The programme "is least original in the parts dealing with foreign affairs," sums up the *Economist* (August 5th).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Unpleasant World Realities

The authors of this kind of mixture of direct untruth and evasion of fact must be relying on the ignorance of their readers, and the unlikelihood of their ever taking the trouble to get hold of the programme and read it for themselves. In reality, one of its outstanding features is precisely that it reflects "the profound changes that have taken place in the world". True enough, it repeats the basic propositions of the analysis of capitalism that were given in the first and second programmes, for the simple reason that a considerable section of the world is still ruled by capitalism. But it points out a very important change in this respect—that the socialist revolutions in Europe and Asia have established a world socialist system, covering one-third of mankind: while a wave of national-liberation revolutions is sweeping away the imperialists' colonial system. "The socialist world is expanding, the capitalist world is shrinking." Whereas earlier stages of the general crisis of capitalism were ushered in by the First and Second World Wars, the principal feature of the third stage which has begun "is that its development was not due to a world war".

Isn't *that* recognition of profound changes since 1919? One can understand the wish of the monopolists that the changes hadn't happened—but it's no use pretending that the Communists of the U.S.S.R. haven't noticed them. And if the programme still shows the world of monopoly-capitalism as "a prey to contradictions"—and in this respect is not "original" enough for the *Economist*—the simple answer is that monopoly-capitalism has not become more original because it has lost its grip over 1,000 million in the socialist countries and some 750 million in the lately liberated colonies. Indeed in all essentials the basis of monopoly-capitalism has not changed since a doughty Socialist wrote over sixty years ago (and thousands sang, to the tune of Private Willis' Song in *Iolanthe*):

> "Your ornamental classes may
> Feel difficulty in believing it,
> But speaking candidly, the way
> You get your living is—by thieving it.
> Wherever Mammon makes his game
> From Liverpool to Trichinopoly,
> The system's every whit the same—
> The merry system of monopoly."

What the critics don't like, in reality, is that the programme in its first part, "The Transition from Capitalism to Communism is the Road of Human Progress", registers the shattering, although not final, defeats sustained by capitalism over these forty-two years. Its first section shows how the coming of imperialism brought with it the destruction of its weakest link—Russian Tsardom: the *Economist* well knows the great efforts made by British financiers and investors to keep that link in existence. The second section provides a magnificent array of the hard facts which make up the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R.: *The Times* could a tale unfold of the blackguardries, the treacheries, the false witness practised by British monopoly-capitalism since 1917 in its attempts to prevent that victory. The third section gives an extensive characterisation of the world socialist system come into being after the Second World War—"the new world being built by the heroic labours of the free peoples in vast areas of Europe and Asia": the *Daily Telegraph* has yielded to none, all these years, in its denunciations of these new socialist countries, and it knows as well as any what a fundamental change in the world has been brought by their victory. Section four gives a far-reaching analysis of the crisis of world state-monopoly capitalism—economic, technical, political—and of those contradictions which *The Times* doesn't like having rammed down its throat. Section five—"The International Revolutionary Movement of the Working Class"—and Section six—"The National Liberation Movement"—deal with subjects on which in any case the millionaire press tries to give as little information as possible, in order not to advertise its opponents. Section six deals with the battle of ideas going on in the world—the struggle of socialist ideas against bourgeois and reformist ideology: the slandering of communism, the propaganda of a "welfare state" (no, the capitalist commentators do *not* bring Selwyn Lloyd and Macmillan in to witness on this), the talk of "the free world", the new fascism that has sprung up all over Western Europe, racialist propaganda, the Churches' butting into politics on the side of capitalism (the late Dr. Buchman's "Moral Rearmament" only one of the more gross and brazen examples). The beauty of it is that the *Daily Mail*, of all newspapers, in its comments on the programme threatens the U.S.S.R. with "ideas" which come "when people get full bellies, good living conditions and time to think"—and the example it gives is . . . youthful hooliganism! Last (Section eight of part I) is "Peaceful Coexistence and the Struggle for World Peace", a plain and (except for professional liars) inescapable statement of the Soviet Union's vested interest in peace. Here some of the capitalist newspapers are good enough to bestow a faint hint of approval. But this does not prevent the *Daily Mirror* and *Daily Sketch* (July 31st) from complaining that the Soviet Union has the biggest armaments in the world—as though it had not offered a dozen times to cut them down to mere police forces, if the U.S.A., Britain and France did the same: and as though our egregious cheesecake press was not foremost in jeering at the Soviet offers.

The truth is that this whole chapter shows conclusively, as its first section says, that "the world capitalist system as a whole is ripe for the social

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolution of the proletariat"—remember those words, in the first programme of the Russian Party, nearly sixty years ago? And that, after all their efforts, makes melancholy reading for the propagandists of capitalism.

Prospects of Communist Society

Even more disturbing for them must be the gigantic prospects drawn in the second part of the programme, "The Tasks of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Building a Communist Society". Not only because of the splendid and inspiring announcement that "the building of a Communist society has become an immediate practical task for the Soviet people", coupled with the fullest scientific definition yet of what communism is (fullest because of forty years' experience of building socialism):

> Communism is a classless social system with one form of public ownership of the means of production and full social equality of all members of society; under it, the all-round development of people will be accompanied by the growth of the productive forces through continuous progress in science and technology; all sources of public wealth will gush forth abundantly, and the great principle "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" will be implemented. Communism is a highly organised society of free, socially conscious working people in which public self-government will be established, a society in which labour for the good of society will become the prime vital requirement of everyone, a necessity recognised by one and all, and the ability of each person will be employed to the greatest benefit of the people.

Long ago, Lenin in *State and Revolution* predicted that "from the bourgeois point of view, it is easy to declare that such a social order is 'sheer utopia'. . . . Even to this day, most bourgeois pundits confine themselves to sneering in this way, thereby displaying both their ignorance and their mercenary defence of capitalism". And, as though anxious to confirm Lenin's accuracy, the capitalist press greeted the passage just quoted, with the practical details listed over the next twenty years, with a choice of epithets: "Communist Paradise" (*The Times*), "Pie in the Sky" (*Daily Telegraph*), "Baloney" (*Daily Sketch*), "Super-piece of Pie-in-the-Sky" (*Daily Mirror*), "Utopia . . . rather tarnished over the years" (*Daily Herald*), "Nineteen Eighty-Four, New Style" (*Economist*)—and so on.

Writing in this way, the defenders of capitalism rely on the ignorance of their readers once again—on their unawareness that the October Revolution itself and the first five-year plan in 1929 were accompanied in the British press by the same kind of caterwauling. But it isn't quite so persuasive now, and the press comments on the various detailed parts of the programme show the embarrassment of their authors: indeed, very many of them bear a strong resemblance to whistling to keep your courage up. "We place little faith in economic targets" (*Daily Mail*); "Russia is as far from catching up with the productive capacity of the West as ever she was" (*Daily Sketch*); the programme "seems to owe more to chartered accountancy than to a revolutionary imagination", while the targets for 1980 are "almost exact projections of the rates of growth in recent years" (*Economist*)—such remarks are a feeble reply to the confident tone of the general plan for the next twenty years.

> The C.P.S.U. being a party of scientific communism, proposes and fulfils the tasks of communist construction in step with the preparation and maturing of the material and spiritual prerequisites, considering that it would be wrong to jump over necessary stages of development, and that it would be equally wrong to halt at an achieved level and thus check progress. The building of communism must be carried out by successive stages.
>
> *In the current decade* (1961-70) the Soviet Union, in creating the material and technical basis of communism, will surpass the strongest and richest capitalist country, the U.S.A., in production per head of population; the people's standard of living and their cultural and technical standards will improve substantially; everyone will live comfortably; all collective and state farms will become highly productive and profitable enterprises; the demand of Soviet people for well-appointed housing will, in the main, be satisfied; hard physical work will disappear; the U.S.S.R. will have the shortest working day.
>
> *In the next decade* (1971-80) the material and technical basis of communism will be created and there will be an abundance of material and cultural benefits for the whole population; Soviet society will come close to a stage where it can introduce the principle of distribution according to needs, and there will be a gradual transition to one form of ownership—public ownership. Thus, *a communist society will on the whole be built in the U.S.S.R.* The construction of communist society will be fully completed in the subsequent period.

Space is lacking to give any adequate treatment of the various sections which follow from these broad aims—tasks in the economic field (industry, agriculture, including social relations in the countryside, management of the national economy); improving living standards (high levels of income and consumption, housing and living conditions, the working day and working conditions, health services, family life and amenities at the public expense); development of the state in the direction of still wider democracy (the Soviets, more public control by the people themselves, the part to be played by mass organisations on the way to the "withering-away" of the state as such in developed communist society, the defence of the U.S.S.R.); relations between Soviet nationalities; ideology, education, science and culture—including the *moral code* of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

builder of communism; co-operation between the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries; and the role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in these momentous years. Nothing can replace reading these historic pages for oneself. When the 1919 programme was being adopted, Lenin said it ought to be a summary for agitators, like the old Erfurt programme of the German Social-Democrats of the nineties: "Every paragraph of that programme contained hundreds of thousands of agitators' speeches and articles. In our programme every paragraph is what every worker should know, master and understand." The same applies to the new third programme of the C.P.S.U.—not, of course, in the way it applies within the Soviet Union, where it will for many years remain a guide to practical activity in the building of communism, but in a way required by British conditions: to help in explaining to British workers what enormous powers and opportunities socialism will bring them here, and to clear away the fog of lies and distortions about socialism in the U.S.S.R. which the agents of capitalism constantly spread.

Press Stupidities

In this sense, and only in this, it is worth while noticing some of the stupidities to which the capitalist press has been reduced in its comments on particular sections of this part of the programme. Referring to the industrial plans, the *Economist* is not the only paper to imply that they "only" carry on what is already embodied in Soviet practice—as though the seven-year plan, adopted by the Twenty-First Congress of the C.P.S.U. in 1959, were not already part of what Khrushchov at that Congress called "a decisive step towards the establishment of a material and technical base for communism" (his speech is available in a *Soviet News* booklet). The *Economist* writes that the programme doesn't "specify clearly how the collective farms are to be turned into state farms"—when Soviet statements have again and again "specified clearly" that they are *not* to be turned into state farms, and the programme equally clearly lays down the road along which they will advance to communist production and distribution on their own lines. The Russians have "far to go" before they achieve "the standards already attained in some advanced welfare states in the West," writes *The Times*, instancing—what would you think—"free drugs and free midday meals for schoolchildren!" It's a pity the *Times* reviewer doesn't read the newspapers: if he did, he would know that the free medicines introduced in Britain after the war have long been abolished, and also the free dinners for schoolchildren (except for the "necessitous"). Whereas what the programme is pledging to all citizens is "free public catering (midday meals) at enterprises and institutions" (this should read "offices"), "and for collective farmers at work". Three weeks' holidays "are not unknown in the West," says the *Economist* loftily: for whom—the *Economist* staff, or for *all* workers by hand and brain?

Rent-free housing, free municipal gas, heating, and water, free public transport, free education for all, including higher education, comfortable homes for the aged and invalids—to be introduced during or at the end of the twenty-year period—are not really free, says the *Daily Herald*: they are really "a system of paying wages partly in kind", and (adds the *Financial Times*) the cost "will have to come from somewhere". Of course it will: you can't hide anything from them. It all comes out of the national income, which has been rising at a fantastic rate, thanks to social ownership and planning, as these figures from the handbook of the Soviet Central Statistical Department show:

Year	*Level of national income in:*		
	U.S.S.R.	*U.S.A.*	*U.K.*
1913	100	100	100
1937	459	142	128
1950	1,003	257	165
1960	2,674	348	204

Moreover, as the programme says, "in the Soviet Union the national income is distributed fairly among the members of society, and there are no parasitical classes as in the bourgeois countries". But it is *not* "a system of paying wages partly in kind". Wages in the U.S.S.R.—the leader-writer in the *Daily Herald* could have learned from the preamble to this part of the programme—represent "the individual payment of working people *according to the quantity and quality of their work*". But the changes announced in the programme represent an increase in that proportion of the national income allocated for consumption by the people "*irrespective of the quantity and quality of their labour*". And the more that proportion grows, the nearer the U.S.S.R. will get to communist society, when people will take only according to their needs, and not according to the work they have done—because they will be (as indeed many of them already are) more enlightened than capitalist economists.

This, by the way, is particularly well illustrated by the would-be facetious remark in the *Economist* commentary that the 1919 Bolsheviks "placed among their long-term aims equality of wages and abolition of money". This is, indeed, a startling discovery: wages are paid in money, money was to be abolished, yet wages were to be equal! Of course, what the 1919 Bolsheviks wrote in their programme was something quite different. Abolition of money was impossible, "so long as communist production and distribution of products has not been fully

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organised". Similarly, while "striving for equality of *reward* for any work and for complete communism", Soviet power could not aim at establishing such equality "at the present time, when only the first steps in the transition from capitalism to communism are being made". In other words, in full communist society there will be neither money nor wages, but all will take what they need from the common store: but before then, both would exist. There is no contradiction between the two programmes in this.

Throughout the second part of the programme there is constant emphasis on the growing direct responsibility and initiative of the mass of the people which is essential if the vast objectives are to be reached. Here are a few outstanding examples. In industry: "Material and moral stimulation of mass invention and innovation movements . . . extensive participation of workers' collectives in the management of enterprises." In agriculture: "By virtue of its organisational structure and its democratic groundwork, which will develop more and more, the collective farm is a social economic form which ensures that production is run by the collective farm members themselves." In planning: "The direct and most active participation of trade unions in elaborating and realising economic plans . . . must be extended more and more, at top level and locally." In public administration: "It is desirable that at least one-third of the total number of deputies be elected anew each time. . . . The trade unions, Y.C.L. and other mass organisations . . . must be given the right to . . . propose draft laws. . . . The most important draft laws should be put to a nation-wide referendum. . . . Inspection by people's control bodies as an effective means of drawing large sections of the people into management of state affairs." Enhancement of the leadership of the Communist Party through "the growth of the creative activity of the masses and the participation of fresh millions of working people in the administration of state affairs and of production. . . . The Party considers it its duty always to consult the working people on the major questions of home and foreign policy, to make these questions an object of nation-wide discussion, and to attract the more extensive participation of non-members in its work".

But all this does not prevent the parrot-cry that Russians "must not expect freedom of choice, or speech, or the right to organise an opposition" (a good cry this, from the *Daily Herald*, whose idea of an "Opposition" is that it should support a Tory Government on all essentials).

Even more ludicrous is the gloomy prophecy of the *Economist* (telling itself bed-time stories in the corner): "The young men, with their matriculation certificates, their greater leisure, their lesser material cares, and their growing itch for wider horizons, may yet fill in, to Mr. Khrushchov's surprise, the unwritten political section of his *Communist Manifesto*." Apart from such trifles as the "political section" being very much "written"—and applying to young women no less than to young men—if there is any hard meaning in these portentous words, it is this: that the more the Soviet people see socialism grow through abundance into communism, the more they are likely to revert to capitalism and to its spastic offspring, right-wing reformism. Why? Has there been the slightest sign of it? Have they ever shown any inclination to go back to employment and rule by a private master? The *Economist* would be hard put to it if it had to answer.

Defeat for Capitalism and Right-Wing Labourism

But it cannot answer—because it was only telling itself a story. Because the new draft programme as a whole is the most devastating, stupendous and final defeat that capitalism has ever suffered on the territory once ruled by Russian capitalists and landowners, foreign concession-holders, bankers and investors. And by that same token it is a defeat for capitalism all over the world. If we had the money, we could issue a three-penny edition, inserting at every paragraph a note on the corresponding state of affairs in Tory-ridden Britain in 1961, and what could be done in a socialist Britain—and it would sell in millions, because the comparison would be deadly.

The comparison would also be deadly for right-wing Labourism. From their very beginnings, the Bolsheviks had to contend with the preachers of "treat the capitalists kindly, they will become Socialists without noticing it" doctrines. Indeed, at their beginnings it was the British Liberal preachers who had crept into the early socialist movement with these ideas—the Fabians—whom they had to thank for it. Eduard Bernstein, who introduced revisionism in the German Social-Democratic Party in 1897, had studied it at their feet—and it was his Russian disciples whom Lenin and others had to fight at the 1903 Congress, on account of their Fabian denial that capitalism involved increasing exploitation, and that the dictatorship of the proletariat was an essential stage on the road to socialism.

When the fight shifted to a broader front, between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, from 1903 to 1917, it was still from the right wing in British Labour that the Bolsheviks' opponents borrowed and adapted their main doctrines—that the working class, in the event of a revolution, was not "fit to govern" yet, and should confine itself to criticising the Liberals: that "politics" should be kept out of its trade unions: that an underground revolutionary party was not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessary, and that a broad Labour Party was the thing.

It was not an accident, either, that after the overthrow of the Tsar in 1917, when the Mensheviks and their friends controlled the Soviets and supported the Provisional Government set up by the capitalist parties, the Labour Party sent its secretary, Arthur Henderson, to Russia to preach support of the world imperialist war, against the attitude of the Bolsheviks. When the Mensheviks became openly counter-revolutionary, for a time after November 7th that year and then permanently after the end of the Civil War, it was the right-wing Labour Party leaders who became their chief sponsors and allies abroad in denouncing the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia as "tyranny".

The Labour leaders have formed a government four times in Britain since then—with what result? The first, a minority government in 1924, so intent on all the parliamentary niceties that more than once it had the organised Trade Union movement up in arms against it, ended in the victory of the Tories eight months later and *five* years of reactionary government. The second, a minority government again for two years, so far from daring to call the workers to action against the capitalist class, proclaimed the employer "a man and a brother", and the system for oppressing India, Egypt and Africa, "the jolly old Empire". It ended in ignominious collapse, during a banker-engineered financial crisis, in 1931—and *nine* years of Tory rule (if we exclude the wartime coalition formed in 1940).

At the General Election of 1945 Labour won an absolute majority—no room now for the plea "we're in office and not in power"—and what did the right-wing leaders make of it? Did they leave Britain one whit more socialist than they found it? Not at all. The nationalisations were so carried out as not to inflict the slightest material injury to the capitalist class—if anything, the reverse. None of the real strongholds of capitalism—the industries manufacturing capital goods and the big "commercial" banks and finance companies—were touched. The social reforms (health and education, pompously proclaimed a "welfare state") did not affect the position of capitalism any more than did their predecessors, the Liberal reforms of 1908-11. And the foreign policy of Bevin and Morrison lined Britain up against the socialist countries and the colonial peoples, with the U.S.A., the world's biggest and most reactionary citadel of finance-capital. And what was the result? A short-lived fourth Labour Government with a small majority, followed by three successive defeats in General Elections—and by now *ten* years of rule again by British big business: with the prospect of at least two more to come, and the claptrap about the "welfare state" daily exposed more and more.

And so reformism, "Labouralism" as it used to be called, co-operation with capitalism as it is in reality, has had its chance in Britain to compete, under far more favourable circumstances, with communism in Russia. Who has won the competition, when all the slanders and brain-twisting of the capitalist press, radio, politicians' speeches, and Church propaganda are set aside? Whose policy, whose country, whose prospects most resemble the best anticipations of the old *British* Socialist pioneers—the S.D.F., the best years of the I.L.P. and S.L.P., William Morris and Robert Blatchford's *Merrie England*—Gaitskell's and Williamson's, or Khrushchov's and Mikoyan's? To ask such a question is, indeed, to answer it. One need only compare the new programme of the advance to communism with the glossiest, most boastful of the Transport House productions. Real socialism, in the form in which historical conditions permitted it, is in the Soviet Union: it could have been flourishing, in British forms, in Britain today, had the leaders of the Labour Party been Socialists instead of Liberals.

And the prospects? Military co-operation with the world's worst reactionaries, British, American and West German, in N.A.T.O. against an invented menace from the socialist countries, in reality for some moment judged suitable by those same reactionaries to attack the U.S.S.R. Passive acceptance of economic co-operation with them in the shape of the "Common Market", proclaimed by the Tory leaders and big business from the house-tops to be the prelude to still worse drives against the people's living standards and real wages. What a reply to the Soviet Union's proclamation of rapidly-advancing living standards and readiness for peaceful, disarmed, expanding trade and cultural relations! What a picture of bankruptcy of Social-Democratic reformism!

Communism = Objective Necessity

The lesson of the new programme is, indeed, world wide in another respect. Like its predecessors, it is the embodiment in its own particular age of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the principles around which the Party was formed and grew. The Communist League which adopted the *Manifesto* of 1848 as a statement of faith numbered barely 400 members, scattered over several countries (not including Russia); yet out of the seeds it sowed grew up large and influential Social-Democratic parties, in the last thirty years of that century. The Russian Social-Democratic Party, at its 1903 Congress, certainly had less than 3,000 members at the time; but the programme it adopted provided the principles to which one section of those members, the Bolsheviks, stuck through thick and thin, and brought them to leadership of the first victorious

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proletarian revolution in a great modern state.

At the 1919 Congress the Party—by then the Russian Communist Party—had 314,000 members: not because it was easy to be a Communist just then, rather the reverse, but because the practice of Soviet power was convincing the most clear-headed and resolute of the workers, peasants and soldiers that a better life for their follow-citizens could come only through support for Lenin and the Bolsheviks. The programme then adopted laid down the lines on which Soviet power and communist policy must build socialism. And if in October 1961 some 9 million members are represented at the Twenty-Second Congress of the C.P.S.U., it is because the Communist programme has once again done the work which it was called upon to do.

The principles of Marxism-Leninism embodied in these successive programmes throughout, therefore, have been an ideological conclusion from working-class revolutionary experience, a superstructure of theory built upon practice—but they have reacted with unerring effect upon revolutionary practice itself, extending it and finding new forms for it which brought new successes of unprecedented dimensions, changing first Russia and then the whole world in the process. Why were they able to do this? Because, in the strict scientific sense, they were *true*, that is, the programmes penetrated at each stage to the direction in which the class struggle, national and international, was moving, and went along with it, looking ahead of it for a whole historical stage and lighting up the way, as it were. The men and women who drew them up took account, in other words, of the objective laws of social development discovered by Marx and Engels. The party which made the programmes and carried them out was acting in accordance with the objective necessity of putting an end to capitalism, establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, and building a new order of society freed from exploitation of man by man. That, in the last analysis, is the secret of their success. We need not doubt that it will lead to a still vaster triumph—the fulfilment of the objective necessity of communist society.

Similar objective necessities exist in this country. Britain in 1961 is more ripe for expropriating monopoly-capitalism and beginning to build socialism than Russia was in 1903, or even 1919. The reason she has not attained it, or begun to build it, or even established the political supremacy of the working class by overthrowing the rule of the capitalists, is not that the British people are different from the Russians. The reason is that the Labour Party which commands the allegiance of most organised British workers is built upon a programme which ignores objective necessity, partly denies it and in general—except for occasional unconscious moments, brought about by some big prod from below—goes against it.

Objective necessity doesn't work by itself. Its operation can be immensely speeded up by the conscious, subjective effort of men and women—or it can be immensely and tragically delayed in its operation. For the objective necessity of socialism to become a reality in Britain, it is not enough to have great trade unions, co-operative societies, a Labour Party taking in all or part of them. A sufficiently strong organisation of men and women, banded together by the principles of Marxism-Leninism, working together on the basis of a Marxist-Leninist programme to go along with objective necessity, is needed as well. There is such an organisation: it is the Communist Party. There is such a programme: it is *The British Road to Socialism.*

It is because the Communist Party has been based on recognition of the objective laws of social development, which apply to Britain no less than to other countries, that it has weathered all storms, confounded all prophets, and steadily grown stronger. It is because the Communist Party is confident of attracting the best forces of the British people to its ranks by the power of its ideas and activities, the power of its programme, that it is so confident of the victory of the working class in Britain as elsewhere.

That is the lesson of working-class and socialist experience in our own country. That is the lesson to be drawn from the great programme of the C.P.S.U. for building communist society in the U.S.S.R.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain's Economy and the Common Market

Leonard Thomas

WHAT a fantastic contrast now appears between the new world of socialism and the old dying world of imperialism! On the one side the new twenty-year programme of the Soviet Communist Party, and on the other the gloom, restrictions and national degradation offered by Macmillan and Selwyn Lloyd.

What future do the Tories now hold out for Britain?

Firstly, the overriding prospect offered by Macmillan is "a long and exhausting struggle over more than one generation" against communism.

Secondly, for this purpose we are told that Britain must now go into the Common Market, an organisation under the political control of ultra-reactionary governments, created principally in order to integrate a rebuilt, remilitarised revenge-seeking West German state into the "Western" alliance, an organisation dedicated to maintaining the hold of the monopoly capitalists over the peoples and economies of Western Europe, and of Africa, too, if it can.

Thirdly, to secure the agreement of these governments to the admission of the U.K., the British Government is prepared to bargain over our national sovereignty, our trade relations with the Commonwealth, the future of British agriculture, and so on.

Fourthly, it is alleged that this is now the only way of solving Britain's economic problems. If then the Common Market demands too high a price for admission, even for Macmillan to accept, the Government threatens us with even worse economic and political difficulties.

Selwyn Lloyd has grimly rubbed in all this gloom with his latest and exceptionally severe new set of economic restrictions, the 7 per cent bank rate, 10 per cent surcharge on indirect taxation, the demand for a wage and salary "pause", the cuts in local authorities' expenditures, and, to cap all, a new addition to our foreign national debt, £714 million borrowed from the International Monetary Fund.

For the Tories to claim that entry into the Common Market is the "solution" to Britain's problems is not simply untrue, but is the exact opposite of the truth. It would represent in fact the continuation of the very policies that have brought the U.K. to its present critical state.

This is abundantly clear so far as the Government's foreign policy is concerned, the policy of the cold war, of subservience to America, of support for the re-creation of German militarism, etc. But what needs also to be emphasised is that it is true equally of the fundamental economic policy of the ruling class, that of trying to maintain at all costs the old parasitic imperial basis for Britain's economy, and the profits the ruling class draws from this.

The real truth of the matter is that the ruling class now sees in the Common Market the only possibility of continuing to pursue the same disastrous policies as before.

The Cold War and Imperialism

The effect of these policies has been to lay on the British economy a huge burden of military expenditures, and in addition to weigh down the U.K.'s international balance of payments with the heavy and still rising cost of military bases abroad, adventures as at Suez and now latterly in Kuwait, and N.A.T.O. military commitments. At the same time the balance of payments has been subjected to the strain of continued large exports of private capital.

In the heyday of British imperialism capital exports and overseas government expenditures were paid for by the return flow of profits from the exploitation of the colonial workers, and the banking interest, insurance commissions, etc., accruing to the City of London. Income from these was, indeed, large enough to pay also for the surplus of imports over exports, a characteristic feature of the parasitic payments account of imperialism.

But the heyday of imperialism is long since over. Its payment account no longer balances, and has lurched from one crisis to another since 1945. The "solution" proposed by the ruling class has been a huge increase in exports to stabilise the position. The rise in exports, however, has never been large enough to achieve this. Government policy has thus become involved in a complete contradiction.

At each crisis it has turned to deliberately restricting the home economy and attacking living standards, to try to keep down imports and force up exports. This, however, combined with the burden of armaments, has further deepened the problem. The development of the economy, its level of capital

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

investment, etc., has been held down below that of many of its capitalist competitors, particularly West Germany, other capitalist countries and Japan. In the struggle for world markets the share of British capitalism has fallen steadily, in every year from 1951 to 1960.

The Present Economic Crisis

Matters have come rapidly to a head again in the present economic crisis. At home industrial production is barely above the level of last year, and on the external front the pound sterling has narrowly avoided devaluation this year.

The basic balance of payments position has deteriorated sharply. Government expenditure abroad rose from £278 million in 1958 to £332 million in 1960, of which in 1960 £215 million was military. After allowing for payments made to foreign capitalists, the net amount coming in from profits, dividends and interest fell from £261 million to £179 million, due notably to reduced profits from oil. Receipts from the other so-called "invisible items" have also fallen. But meantime British private capital exports have continued at a rate of around £300 million per annum, while rather less foreign capital has come into the U.K. than before. On top of all this, the balance between imports and exports has worsened, a quite exceptional export surplus of £62 million in 1958 becoming a deficit of £366 million in 1960.

Since the beginning of 1961 a new crisis of the pound sterling has come upon us in full force. It has been particularly severe since West Germany underlined the strength of its economic position by increasing the exchange rate for its own currency, the Deutschemark. This loosed off a great speculation against the pound; many financial operators considered that it would have to be devalued. In fact a devaluation was only warded off by the U.K. receiving emergency financial assistance from West Germany and other West European countries. The central banks of these countries agreed to buy up pounds which the private operators were selling, and sit on them for the time being. These pounds, however, represent new British debts, and debts be it noted to Common Market countries in particular.

But this is not all. Partly to pay off some of these debts, partly to restore international confidence in the pound sterling by replenishing the gold and dollar reserves, the British Government has had to raise a new loan of £714 million from the International Monetary Fund. *The Economist* wrote on August 12th:

> The biggest speculative drain that sterling, or any other currency has ever experienced has been followed by the biggest stabilisation credit that the International Monetary Fund, or any other international institution, has ever made available.

The crisis of the balance of payments has reached a point at which British capitalism has to seek direct assistance not only from the U.S.A., as before, but also from its competitors in the Common Market. The U.K. has borrowed from the I.M.F., in addition to American dollars, the currencies of West Germany, France, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium (i.e. every Common Market country; little Luxembourg has the same currency as Belgium), and of Japan, Sweden and Canada.

We do not know exactly what conditions were imposed by West Germany and the other countries when they agreed to sit on the "surplus pounds", as above. But we do know that the I.M.F. agreed to lend the U.K. money only after Selwyn Lloyd had announced his new Budget, and that other conditions were also imposed, namely that the U.K. would not devalue the pound or put controls on imports.

The position is that, even before entering the Common Market, the British Government is no longer master in its own economic house. This fact has played an important role, both in determining the severity of the restrictive measures imposed by Selwyn Lloyd, and in pushing the Government into its decision to apply for membership of the Common Market.

One might have imagined that in face of this disastrous further deterioration of the balance of payments, the Tory Government would at last have begun to turn away from the policies which have produced it. But not a bit of it.

Military expenditures are to be "reviewed", but there is no indication that they will be cut. The whole line of the Government's policy, continued adventures as in Kuwait and the deliberate intensification of the cold war around the question of Berlin, point rather to their maintenance or further increase. On overseas government expenditures all the Government says is that they should not be allowed to increase any more. An effort will be made to persuade the West Germans to pay for the cost of keeping British troops in that country, £65 million a year. If they are so persuaded, they will, no doubt, have some counter-concession in mind for the Common Market negotiations.

Similarly the British capitalists are still to be allowed to send their capital abroad. The only change is that the Government may be less willing to give its O.K. in certain cases, and that the capitalists are asked to bring rather more of their profits home.

The basic policies thus remain unchanged. All that has changed is that the British ruling class has had to accept the fact that its economic and political position *vis-à-vis* West Germany and the Common Market has weakened drastically. It has, therefore, to abandon its previous efforts to build up a counter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bloc in Western Europe to the Common Market, i.e. the European Free Trade Association, and itself seek to enter into the Common Market. It proposes, in other words, to make a deal, politically and economically, with this group of rival powers, which are now too strong for it to resist.

Entry into the Common Market

But because of the weakened position of British capitalism, this deal presents considerable problems. The Common Market countries insist that their arrangements are already made, their organisation is taking practical shape, and the U.K. will have to make sacrifices to enable it to come in.

Negotiations concerning the entry of the U.K. into the Common Market have not yet begun as this is written, and it remains to be seen exactly what course they will take. On the economic side, however, it is clear that among the major issues are those of British agriculture and Commonwealth Tariff Preference. On both of these the British Government will have to make sacrifices.

Here, however, and over the whole field involved in the negotiations, the British Government quite obviously aims to turn the situation to the advantage of the social force which it represents, namely monopoly capitalism. It proposes to do so both by ensuring that any sacrifices involved fall on other people, and not on the great monopolists, and by using the situation to weaken the resistance of these other people to the attacks of monopoly capitalism.

First and foremost, the previous attack on the living standards of the mass of the British people is to be continued and intensified. Selwyn Lloyd's new restrictive measures are so severe as to have led journals of by no means left-wing opinion to raise the question as to whether they are not intended to produce a definite recession. The purpose is to cut consumption by increasing taxation, while at the same time enforcing a "pause" in wage and salary increases. To reinforce the opposition of the employers to wage demands a direct attack has been launched against Government employees, starting with the teachers and proceeding from them to the Civil Servants. The British Employers' Confederation has stated flat that if the U.K. goes into the Common Market there will be no wage increases that are not preceded by increases in productivity. Standards of living are also under attack through cuts in the local authorities' expenditures, withdrawal of the funds intended to assist the purchase of older houses, and so on.

Mr. Selwyn Lloyd tells us that he is not afraid of the word "planning". Nor is he. He had already sketched his ideas for the "planned" restrictions in future of Government expenditures, restrictions which are likely to fall heavily on all forms of social investment. He also wants a long-term "plan" to keep wages down.

But the attack is now to go beyond the mass of ordinary working people. British agriculture is now to be brought in. The Government clearly sees in entry into the Common Market an opportunity to cut down the agricultural subsidies and to effect reductions in taxation on profits, which the big monopolies insistently demand.

Originally with the purpose of keeping down wages, retail prices of food in Britain have traditionally been kept at *relatively* low levels by letting in imports free, or at low tariff rates (with lower rates still for Commonwealth products) while paying subsidies to home agriculture. The Common Market set-up is, however, quite different. While tariffs and other controls on exports of agricultural products from one Common Market country to another will eventually be eliminated, the agricultural producers within the Market will be protected from outside competition by a special system of levies on imports. Food prices within the Common Market will thus be kept up at a higher level than world market prices.

The U.K. would have to impose levies also on imports from non-Common Market countries, abandon for the most part its system of agricultural subsidies, and open its home market to imports from the other Common Market countries. The consumer would pay more for his food, and the Government would save the cost of the subsidies. Some sectors of British agriculture could, no doubt, meet the competition of the agricultural producers of the Common Market. But the sectors which could not do so would presumably go under. What has to be appreciated here is that the output of many Common Market agricultural producers is rising quite sharply; the British Government may, therefore, be prepared to make a considerable sacrifice of the interests of British agriculture in order to get concessions in another field which is more important to monopoly capitalism.

The Commonwealth Countries

Next in line for the chopping-block come the agricultural producers of the Commonwealth countries. The economies of a whole number of these countries have been developed in the past primarily to supply the British market with foodstuffs and raw materials. Their exports of these products come into the U.K. either duty free, or at preferential rates of duty. The U.K.'s import tariffs, however, under the Common Market, would have to be brought into line with the common external tariff wall being erected round the Common Market, and France in particular objects most strongly to the idea of tariff preferences being given to any outside countries except those that enter into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

special association with the Common Market, e.g. a number of ex-colonies of France in Africa.

The Commonwealth would suffer most particularly in respect of temperate agricultural products (dairy produce etc.) which compete directly with the products of Western European agriculture. But Canada, Australia and India are also concerned at the prospective loss of markets in the U.K. for exports of manufactured goods, which their economies increasingly produce.

It may be that the British Government will be able to secure in negotiations with the Common Market that Commonwealth countries should have a transitional period in which to try to re-orient their economies away from the British market. But here again the British Government has taken this opportunity to tell New Zealand bluntly that the U.K. will not in any case in future provide an expanding market for New Zealand agricultural products.

The elimination, gradual or otherwise, of Commonwealth tariff preference by the U.K. must lead in time to the loss of tariff preferences granted by Commonwealth countries to U.K. exports. To a degree this is a sacrifice to be imposed on British manufacturing industry as a whole, as part of the price of entry into the Common Market. But here it must be noted that this particular sacrifice will not fall with equal severity on all British concerns. On the contrary, the effects are likely to be most severe on the smaller and medium capitalists.

A number of facts point to this.

Firstly, particularly since the war, there has been a very marked tendency for the big capitalist groups in Britain to set up their own manufacturing subsidiaries within the Commonwealth. The sales of these subsidiaries and the profits from them will be in no wise affected by any decline in U.K. exports to the Commonwealth.

Secondly, the big concerns are in a much better position to protect their exports, because they have not relied exclusively on tariff preferences and on the traditionally favourable general conditions for U.K. exports to the Commonwealth. On the contrary, they have in many cases very elaborate selling and trading organisations established in these countries. An outstanding example is Unilever's United Africa Company.

Entry into the Common Market will also involve the reduction and final elimination of U.K. tariffs levied on industrial products coming from Common Market countries, while at the same time these countries will similarly reduce and finally eliminate their tariffs against U.K. industrial products. In general U.K. manufacturing industry enjoys at present a relatively high level of tariff protection and in particular a higher level than West German industry. The competitive position of British industry at the international level appears to be relatively weak, as is shown on the one side by its declining share of total world markets for manufactured goods, and on the other by the recent sharp increase in U.K. imports of manufactured goods. The opinion generally expressed is that U.K. imports of such goods are likely to rise more rapidly than U.K. exports as a result of entering the Common Market.

This will be to the detriment, in the first case of course, of the balance of payments and also of British industry considered as a whole. The Government insists, however, that in the long run the result of the loss of tariff protection and the sharpening of competition will be to the advantage of the British economy because it will force it to become more competitive. It requires no emphasis in this context that this is first of all an incitement, more than that, a brutal coercive applied to British employers as a whole to resist wage demands and to force up the rate of their exploitation of labour.

The Big Monopolies

Here again, however, it is necessary to distinguish between the position of the big monopoly groups and the larger number of medium and smaller capitalists. First of all the big monopolists have already started to protect their profits by setting up their own manufacturing subsidiaries in the Common Market countries or by entering into one sort of agreement or another with their big rivals in these countries. Because of their size and their capital resources the big concerns are also in a much better position to re-deploy in face of competitive conditions. One of the striking features of the recent period has been the switching of capital by the really big concerns into quite new lines of business, where existing lines no longer appear to offer adequate profit prospects or are threatened with too much competition.

What is described as a process of making the British economy more efficient and competitive is more correctly to be seen as a means of enforcing a further concentration of capital and of production, and of assisting the continued aggrandisement of the big monopoly concerns at the expense of the smaller capitalists. The two things are not at all the same.

British monopoly capital is not concerned with the efficiency and rate of growth of the economy as such, nor with the solution of the balance of payments as such. Contrary to what we are now told, there is no magic in a huge "common market" dominated by giant monopolies, to solve a nation's economic problems, internal or external. If there were, the U.S.A. would not now be suffering unemployment counted in millions, a weak rate of economic growth, and balance of payments problems which produced a dollar crisis last year. The solution of the U.K.'s real national economic problems is not what the Macmillan Government is seeking. What it is con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cerned with is the interests, at home and abroad, of the British monopoly capitalist class.

The British people should not be bamboozled with tales of the Common Market as the key to ultimate prosperity. The West German "economic miracle" of growth in production, exports and capital accumulation took place on the basis of an extremely high rate of exploitation of labour, itself made possible by the existence for many years of a huge reserve army of unemployed. The "adjustment" of the French economy to the Common Market necessitated first of all a devaluation of the franc and a sharp reduction in living standards. These are the means by which monopoly capitalism "solves" economic problems, and these are the means which the Macmillan Government would like to apply to Britain's economic problems.

Nor is the present high level of economic activity in the Common Market something that will continue automatically for ever. Particular phases of growth in the economies of these countries, booms if you like, will no more prove to be permanent and everlasting than they have in any other capitalist economy.

We have had the experience that at one stage the British Government saw the solution of the balance of payments problem very largely in terms of higher exports to the U.S.A. For a time exports to that country did increase. But having reached a peak in 1959 they have since fallen away heavily, as the car industry well knows, and their future is uncertain given the tendency of the American economy to stagnate.

Now the British Government wants to stake all on an increase in exports to the Common Market countries. The success of this policy is likely to prove as ephemeral as its previous "dollar export" policy. Indeed, the wish to make a major switch in the U.K.'s export orientation, away from the Commonwealth and towards the Common Market, spotlights one of the principal contradictions and weaknesses in the present development of international trade in the non-socialist world sector. This is the tendency for the trade of the primary-producing and economically underdeveloped countries to lag behind, and for increases in international trade to take place mainly through the expansion in the exports of the main capitalist countries to each other. There is, in fact, a narrowing of the markets for the exports of the main manufacturing countries, an increasing lop-sidedness in international trade, and a limitation on its prospects of growth.

We come, finally, to the point that what the British Government aims also to preserve by entry into the Common Market are the international financial interests of monopoly capital. As has been said, it has no apparent intention of seriously interfering with the export of capital from the U.K., and it must be noted here that the Common Market arrangements will provide for the complete freedom of the capitalists to move their money from one Common Market country to another. What it seeks, in view of the present difficulties of the pound sterling, is some sort of merging or close association of British international financial interests with the financial interests of West Germany, France, etc., capable at once of providing the necessary assistance to the pound sterling and of enabling the export of British capital and all the associated profitable activities of the City of London to continue as before.

An Alternative Policy

To paraphrase Clausewitz' famous saying, for British monopoly capitalism entry into the Common Market is to be the continuation of its old policies by new means.

This could lead only to the further aggravation of the political and economic difficulties and dangers that the people of Britain now face.

The fight against the Common Market is, and must be, at the same time a fight for a new way forward for Britain.

Above all it is a fight to cut ourselves away from the disastrous policies, organisations and entanglements of the cold war. Without this there can be no serious start to tackle our economic and social needs.

In the immediate situation it is necessary to defend the living standards of the people, in the broadest sense, against all the attacks launched against them.

Alongside of this it now becomes clearer than ever that the principal obstacle to the prosperity and prospects of the British people is the domination of the country by an imperialist monopoly capitalist class, the domination of its politics at home and abroad by this decadent class, the domination of its industry and its foreign trade, the domination of its education—in brief, a stranglehold on every aspect of our national existence.

Socialism, the taking over by the nation of the great industrial and financial monopolies, holds the key, and the only key, to the way ahead, to the necessary reorganisation of our economy, of its trade and other international economic relations. More and more the choice imposes itself, either to accept a thrusting down of living standards in order to enable monopoly capitalism and imperialist policies to continue, or to throw off the yoke of monopoly capitalism.

(See announcement of Discussion School on the Common Market, page 3 of cover)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Future of British Sport

John Tarver

ONCE upon a time, the story runs, we always won, and didn't care. Then we always lost, and still didn't care. Now we always lose, but care like mad. Like most of its type, this wry tale holds a morsel of truth. Its three episodes can be linked together. Perhaps the first ended near the year 1924, when Britain failed to maintain its leading position in the Olympic Games and was without a world boxing champion for the first time.

The second certainly ended in 1948, when Bradman's Australians crushed English cricket while our Olympic sportsmen fared worse than ever. These overwhelming defeats took place in Britain itself, under the scrutiny of millions of fans who had never witnessed the highest class of international sport before. The demand for change has grown stronger and stronger since that scorching summer.

British success at sport actually has passed through three phases, as the rest of the world first acquired and then mastered all of the sporting techniques which had originated here—owing to the peculiar pre-eminence of British capitalism—as well as adding many national sports of their own to the international list.

The real story, of course, does not fall into a uniform pattern. In a wide range of sports which began in the British Isles supremacy has passed to other nations, with Britain often quite outside the top flight. On the other hand, millions of British people have developed an interest in many sports which at one time were dismissed as of minor importance. The role of the press and TV has increased enormously, exerting a profound and very mixed influence. Ideas of social change and social responsibility have taken root in our country.

The overall effect of these changes has been to kill the old view that sport is a world of its own. No longer is sport a back-page item only. No one now seriously contends that sport can be completely separated from political life, though this was widely accepted until about ten years ago.

Both the Labour and the Conservative Party produced pamphlets dealing with sport in time for the 1959 General Election. Labour's *Leisure for Living* and the Tory *The Challenge of Leisure* were the outcome of special study groups.

However, after the two pamphlets had served their purpose as election material, total inactivity followed. Tired of this and under pressure, ninety-nine Tory M.P.s urged the Government to open discussions with local authorities in order to achieve the aims of the Wolfenden Report. Sixty-seven Labour M.P.s went further, and called for a Sports Development Council to carry out the Wolfenden Plan in full. Forty-one M.P.s had previously given evidence to the Wolfenden Committee.

Our Record

There is ample ground for concern. The people of our country do not enjoy access to the full delight of sport and physical culture, which ranks as one of their human rights. The fruit of this underlying scarcity is revealed when British sportsmen suffer defeat. For a nation with such a record of civilised advance as our own, failure to progress in sport is a particularly severe indictment. Sporting success is an important yardstick of the cultural opportunities open to the citizens of a country.

It is not possible to state precisely the extent of Britain's decline as a sporting power. There is one more or less accurate gauge, however: the results of the Olympic Games.

Some sports are not included in the Olympic programme, which has become somewhat too narrow, but few of these do not share the same trend of decline. In speaking of the Olympics it is frequently claimed that Britain is doing well if our sportsmen win a quarter of the prizes won by nations four times the size, like the U.S.S.R. or U.S.A. This is an absurd argument, because all countries are limited to a few entries in each event and cannot enter teams in proportion to their population.

Launched in 1896, the Modern Olympic Games did not begin to become fully representative of world sport until after the First World War and earlier results cannot be properly compared with later ones. For example, the Games of 1904 were held in conjunction with the St. Louis Fair, celebrated in songs like "Take Me To St. Louis", and American sportsmen filled first and second and third places in seventy-seven of the one hundred and two events. The 1908 Games, like those of 1948, took place in London; unlike them, they were dominated by British athletes.

The following figures show—(a) the number of Gold Medals won by Britain; (b) the total number of Medals won by us; (c) the total number of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

events; (d) our Medals as a percentage of all the Medals awarded:

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
1896	3	8	43	6.2
1908	57	141	109	43.1
1912	10	40	107	12.4
1920	15	42	162	8.6
1936	4	14	129	3.6
1948	3	22	136	5.4
1960	2	20	150	4.4

It is not difficult to see why British sport has declined. The sporting resources of any nation are defined by the degree of mass participation in sport by its people. Here is the central weakness of sport in Britain. The Wolfenden Report tended to gloss over this key point, even counting the unknown number of people who cycle for pleasure or play table-tennis at home as an argument against undue pessimism! The narrow scale of participation in sport by the British people is a serious matter for the future of our country. It is allied to a general and severe shortage of open space and room for recreation. These are essential features of the narrowness of life under capitalism.

The Nature of Sport

Why should stress be laid upon the value of sport? What, in fact, is sport?

Sport is a skilled human activity, regulated by various definite rules, in which individuals or groups of people seek to improve their physical culture through competition.

Sport is a part of the general culture of a people. By its nature it enhances the moral, physical and mental powers of those who take part in it, and so fulfils an indispensable social function. Sport is the product of man's imagination and his response to the challenge of pitting his physical prowess against hazard and stress. The imaginative and aesthetic aspect of sport becomes more important as skill is acquired. Skill, in itself the reward of hard training, is the key to a realm of greater freedom of action, where will-power and creative ability are dominant qualities. The true expert is a sportsman who has developed the capacity to innovate, seize the initiative, display cool judgment and summon deep reserves of courage and self-confidence.

Young people are right to seek after the mastery of skill in sport, for until it is painstakingly acquired the full joy of a fit and responsive physique is out of reach. To succeed in sport demands much more than to become fit or to find relaxation in a brisk game, but it gives more in return. Sport offers to all young people a chance to advance toward maturity, to gain self-control, to learn the value of loyalty, comradeship and selflessness.

Sport is not unique in this respect. Indeed, its effects may be twisted and altered. It offers a chance; whether the chance is taken or not depends upon people themselves.

People exist in society, and Britain is still a capitalist country. The radical change in the relationship between sport and society since about 1920 has taken place under capitalist conditions. Sport has ceased to be the exclusive privilege of a few but, as part of the same process, scope for commercialism has grown immensely. After all, the vast majority of the means for bringing the mass of the people into sporting life—erecting buildings, hiring space, supplying equipment, advertising, lending money—are yet under firm commercial control.

Capitalism has created a three-way split in British sport. On the one hand, the facilities of public school, university, officers' mess and extensive leisure designed for the ruling class itself. On the other, the whole field of public sporting events as a source of profit. Third, the neglect of providing for the great majority of our youth.

Thus the complex problem of sport and physical culture is a class question. The British working class, which capitalism would prefer turned into a passive instrument for money-making, must carry forward the banner of our nation's sport.

The Tory Attack

The Government's attitude is shown by the fact that no central plan exists. Amateur sport is kept in poverty and professional sport left free for commercial interests.

From professional sport the Government extracts roughly £100 million. This sum, of course, enters the Treasury. To amateur sport the Government gives some £400,000. Official responsibility is divided between the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Housing and Local Government.

The former administers school sport and grants to amateur bodies. It is impossible to disentangle expenditure on sporting facilities from general spending on schools, but it is certainly less than £10 million. The Housing Minister is in charge of capital expenditure and loans to local authorities. The total loans granted for swimming baths, recreation fields and pleasure grounds fluctuate wildly. Between 1956 and 1957 they were more than halved. By 1960 they had risen fivefold, to £5,777,000. Now they are being harshly cut again. Tory financial policy, without any relation to the needs of sport, has determined the amounts available.

Every amateur sport lacks facilities and cash.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The vast majority of swimming pools are over fifty years old. There are only 792 publicly owned baths in Britain, many of which are closed during the winter. Because there are just two Olympic-standard swimming pools in Britain, at Blackpool and Cardiff, young Brian Phelps, who captured a Bronze Medal for diving in Rome, had to travel almost 200 miles for his training before the Games. He trained each week-end in Cardiff, though he lives in London, the biggest city in the world!

For athletics, there are about 200 cinder tracks in Great Britain, many of them privately owned and many more without satisfactory amenities. Of the twenty-three London tracks seven are privately owned and a mere four possess floodlights, an essential for winter training. In Berkshire and Suffolk there is one track, but even they are better off than Devon and Oxfordshire, whose solitary tracks are privately owned.

However, the facilities for indoor sports are the worst of all. The Central Council of Physical Recreation and the National Playing Fields Association are now conducting a joint survey into their difficulties. New, growing sports like basketball, volleyball and badminton are crippled by the lack of suitable premises. All such indoor halls are grossly over-used, often leading to the less popular sports being squeezed out.

With taxation, rating, the Rent Act and purchase tax on equipment, every sports club faces daunting problems today.

Wolfenden's Anniversary

In the midst of this situation of neglect and decline the Central Council of Physical Recreation appointed a committee under Sir John Wolfenden in October 1957. Its terms of reference were extremely wide and its report appeared just a year ago, in September 1960. The Wolfenden Committee was set up and conducted its work under a Tory Government. It is an apt commentary that the whole of its advice has just been rejected by the Tory Chancellor in the course of imposing a fresh offensive against the standard of life of the British people.

The Wolfenden Report has proved to be of great value, less for what it said than for what it provoked. Discussion about sport has entered a new stage as a result of the mass interest which preceded, accompanied and followed the work of the Wolfenden Committee. Nevertheless, this is not in the tradition of the great reforming proposals of many bourgeois committees in the past.

Though it sat for three years the Wolfenden Committee did not amass much fresh evidence about the state of British sport. As its report points out: "It is almost unbelievable, but it is true, that comprehensive information is nowhere available." The committee could have issued an invaluable statistical supplement to help in remedying this. A corresponding timidity of attitude mars the whole report. The central weakness in the Wolfenden Plan is its refusal to demand a powerful central council for the development of sport. Without this, its proposals resemble a boat without a motor.

However, modest though they are, if its proposals were put into effect a marked change for the better would be under way in British sport. The Wolfenden Committee set out its standpoint in these words: "We want to see young people, particularly at the stage of adolescence, given the opportunity for tasting a wide range of physical activities . . . which is at present denied."

The committee drew up fifty-seven main conclusions and recommendations. The principal are:

(1) More information from overseas.

(2) Closer links between sport and the Youth Service.

(3) A reduction of restrictions on open-air activity, such as camping, canoeing, climbing, hiking and sailing.

(4) Dual use of facilities belonging to factories, colleges, etc., at present frequently idle.

(5) Experimental multi-sports centres, provided in the main by local authorities.

(6) Improvement in coaching, with financial aid.

(7) Greater co-operation between all bodies concerned with sport.

(8) Further discussion about the future of amateurism, with a view to observing rules and ending anomalies.

(9) Greater attention to accuracy on the part of the press.

(10) A restrained increase in amateur sport on Sundays.

(11) Special help to sport in Northern Ireland.

(12) The formation of a Sports Development Council.

(13) £5 million per year from the Government, £5 million from local authorities.

Very few of these proposals are novel. Some of them are weak. Yet together they form a charter for amateur sport which already commands widespread support. They need some strengthening, and the driving force of a mass campaign to win them. The most necessary and important proposals are the last two and the fifth. Equally, they are the ones which are being most bitterly resisted.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Council of Sport

A Sports Development Council of the type suggested by the Wolfenden Committee would be comparatively ineffective. It would consist of between six and ten well-known people subordinate to either the Lord President of the Council or the Chancellor of the Exchequer and its powers would be limited to advice, the distribution of Treasury money, the encouragement of local authority expenditure and the collection of information.

A more invigorating and progressive type of council would combine all-round attention to the needs of our people with the power to carry out a far-reaching programme. Such a council, a Council of Sport and Physical Culture, would be a large and representative body. It would be drawn in, say, equal numbers from the governing bodies of amateur sport and the mass organisations of the people. It would work in direct and independent association with the Government. Local councils of a similar type would be established, with a great measure of independence for the Scottish and Welsh; in Northern Ireland one aim of the local council would be to foster co-operation with sportsmen in Eire. Sub-committees would be appointed and there would be a large full-time staff—research and planning would present huge problems from the very first.

The Council would have the power to co-ordinate plans for sporting progress and physical recreation throughout Britain and it would be able to prepare schemes jointly with local authorities, ensuring that they were carried out. It is likely that the initiative for ambitious plans would come from the governing bodies of sport, and though the Council's scope would supersede the work of several existing bodies with more limited interests and resources, there would be no need for interference in the autonomy of individual sports organisations if ample funds were available. It is scarcity which leads to the favouring of one at the expense of others and the essence of a Council of Sport would be a fundamental change in the financial policy of Parliament.

The birth of such a leadership for sport would be a victory for our youth and working people. It will not come without struggle—against the Government, against commercialism, against the pre-1939 outlook which survives in the administration of many of our sports.

Sports Centres

The heart of the regeneration of British sport will be the Sports Centre. Our country is a densely populated and highly developed one. New estates and whole new towns are coming into being and there can be no doubt that this process will become more marked when bigger social transformations begin. Sport and physical culture must find a natural place within the planning of every local community, not be shunted off to distant suburbs or Victorian backwaters.

Ideally, a Sports Centre combines outdoor and indoor activities. These are almost invariably found apart in this country, unlike many abroad, with consequent waste and disunity. However, in view of the difficulty of procuring land sufficient for outdoor sport in the centres of urban dwelling where Sports Centres are most needed, a high proportion of centrally grouped facilities in Britain could not cater for any but indoor pursuits. In the future planning of new towns and large estates Sports Centres of the comprehensive type should certainly be included. Harlow New Town is the pioneer in this respect.

About half the counties in England and Wales and several in Scotland and Northern Ireland contain at least one town with more than 100,000 people. We should set the objective of winning Sports Centres in these counties before the end of the 1960's. They would be regional centres for their own and neighbouring counties, extending their influence across scores of miles through the work of a first-class coaching service.

Coaching

Beyond question, advance in sport depends upon better coaching. Real growth in our sport demands more facilities, playing fields and equipment but the best of these can lie idle. Go to a cinder track; watch a fourteen-year-old schoolgirl paying her first visit; fascinated, she meets for the first time a long-jump trainer who can demonstrate the hitch-kick; this is a vital, irreplaceable ingredient in sport.

The recent dispute between the A.A.A. and its Chief Coach has drawn attention to the scandalous neglect of coaching in this country. The Wolfenden Committee devoted a great deal of time to considering the matter, though without producing any original proposal. Coaching is a profession, yet British coaches have generally been expected to make any number of personal sacrifices and accept servants' treatment. If our sport is to progress we must develop a new vocation—a Service of Sport. Such a profession could be under the care of the Council of Sport and Physical Culture in conjunction with its affiliated organisations. It would be based upon high standards: a professional salary scale, entry qualifications, colleges and classes for further training, a pension.

Given such a system, sport among British youth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could be put on an entirely new footing. During a boy's school years he would be assisted by coaches from the nearest sports centre, working in co-operation with his school. After his transition to working life he would find help from precisely the same coaches at his factory club. A bridge would be thrown across "the gap" of adolescence which so disturbed the Albemarle, Crowther and Wolfenden Committees.

Health and Fitness

Extending far beyond the question of sport itself is the general problem of physical culture. Open space is in short supply and commercial interests repeatedly encroach upon what there is. Less and less remains for recreation in our towns and it is not easy to find any substitute for the lost opportunity of maintaining fitness near home.

The National Parks Commission and the Youth Hostels Association have done a great deal to make the countryside of Britain accessible to working people but, in the words of the Wolfenden Report, "what is wanted . . . is more understanding of people's widening needs by the authorities who control access to much of our terrain . . . more could be done by local authorities and, mainly for young people, by local education authorities."

The problem of planning for health must be tackled by local authorities. In new urban designs there can be no excuse for an absence of open space, laid out for leisure, recreation and casual sport. The National Playing Fields Association recommends a minimum of six acres of playing field space, excluding school fields, for every 1,000 people. "In all parts of the country," the Wolfenden Report admits, "we are very far from that target." In 1956 a survey covering 23,500,000 people—nearly half the population of Great Britain—showed that the average playing field space available to them was, in fact, 1·46 acres per thousand.

If local sports centres were set up, with adequate staff, they would be of particular value to working women and housewives, who today are often compelled to disregard their own fitness. It is no flight of fancy to picture co-operation between the sports centres and health centres of the future.

In British circumstances an essential part of the fight for a fit and sporting people is the struggle to change the character of our higher education. By opening more universities and increasing the number of students from the working class we would bring a vast new range of young people into contact with the superior facilities now confined to a fortunate hundred thousand. At the same time an improvement in our university facilities, which are not all keeping pace with the most modern ideas, would be stimulated.

Finance

The Wolfenden Committee was forced to conclude, at a time when spending by local authorities was at a peak, that "it is quite clear that many local authorities are anxious to incur still greater capital expenditure on the provision of much-needed facilities for sport, especially swimming baths, than present government restrictions allow."

Local councils have faced appalling difficulties in carrying out their plans, although most of these have been the reverse of extravagant. However, it is not merely the Tory policy of credit control which needs changing. The government must be forced to assume the main financial responsibility for sport and physical culture.

One major failing of the Wolfenden Committee was to accept without comment the sum of £5 million of government aid chosen by the Tory and Labour Parties in their pre-election propaganda and to add another £5 million of local expenditure to it. This total of £10 million looks impressive, but it is really just a round figure, picked almost arbitrarily. Finance must be calculated in relation to need, not abstractly.

The construction of a basic network of sports centres during the next ten years would cost between £100 and £200 million. In addition all amateur sports require assistance to ensure financial stability. An immediate programme to spend £100 million during the next five years is needed as a foundation.

As militant enthusiasts were putting forward this target in Britain, the French Government acted. Its expenditure of £100 million in five years will create twenty-five national sports centres, 100 multi-sports grounds, 120 athletic tracks, 750 youth hostels, 1,000 gymnasiums and no fewer than 250 Olympic-size swimming pools to compete with Britain's two.

Commercialism

Because it imposes the test of profit, British capitalism has stunted the development of sport and culture. Its effect has become more damaging with the growth of monopoly. Land, building, equipment, publicity, finance itself—all have come under the predominant control of small groups of monopolists. Scores of chances to help sport have been allowed to pass by, but very few chances to make profit. The current closure of cinemas is a striking example. At least some of their empty premises could have been converted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into sports centres; instead they have become bowling alleys.

The secretary of a boys' football team in a large provincial town recently wrote to a Sunday paper. He described how last December his boys moved into an ex-factory building owned by their local council. Within twelve months, however, this temporary clubroom of theirs was due to be demolished. No alternative was in sight. The club had no access to showers. After matches, twenty-two boys had to swill themselves from one bucket of cold water in the public park. Club funds stood at £50, to meet a monthly rent of £12 plus electricity, water, booking and travelling charges, and the club's only income was 30s. from weekly subscriptions and the proceeds from selling Coca-Cola.

On such foundations do we try to erect an edifice of sport. The difficulties in the way of young players could be overcome without elaborate measures, for their initiative and industry are very great. Unless they are overcome the stream of talent flowing into our sport will dry up. The test of profit—no outlay without a predictable return—stands in the way. Hence commercialism throttles the channel which feeds it. The problem has become so acute that several commercial firms have been induced to act. A great deal of amateur sport is now kept alive chiefly through their intervention. In 1960 the famous Amateur Athletic Association received £5,250 from the Treasury, £4,200 from its supporters' clubs, and £4,700 from the *News of the World*.

The Milk Marketing Board helps cycling, junior table tennis is helped by the Mirror-Pictorial group and the *Evening Standard* helps youth boxing. The National Playing Fields Association received nothing from the government in 1959, but £15,000 from the Variety Club and £7,500 from Butlins.

The commercial side of sport is itself in crisis. Far off are the post-war years when boxing, cricket, football, racing and speedway led a tempestuous boom in the profits accruing to promoters and bookmakers.

The demands of the monopolies which rent land and buildings, and of the financiers who control a major proportion of professional sport, have grown more and more exorbitant. The comfort and convenience of the public have been set aside, standards of skill have been allowed to fall in search of "crowd appeal" and the result has been to drive the public away. Without sufficient revenue, the prospects for commercial sport have not proved attractive to its backers. Two cases prove the point:

Boxing. The number of shows falls each year. It is one-third of the pre-war figure. In Scotland, an historic centre of the sport, there were only eleven professional shows during the whole of 1960.

Football. Attendance at Football League matches has persistently dropped since its huge rise after 1945; 28 million in the last pre-war season and 35 million in 1946-47, it rose to 41 million in 1948-49. By 1959-60 it had fallen to 32 million and last season the drop was sharpest of all—to 29 million, a record 3 million fewer.

A curb must be placed upon commercialism. To break its grip will be a long process but, as a beginning, the Pools firms and major gambling enterprises should be bought out by the state, and local authorities should be granted the power to promote sporting contests and encouraged to gain revenue in this way for the benefit of local recreation. Steps must be taken to safeguard the welfare of players and spectators, along the lines suggested in the *Daily Worker* plan for football.

The Way Forward

The British public is not losing interest in sport. If proof is needed the extraordinary spread of interest in athletics, cycling, fencing, gliding, scrambling, swimming, weight-lifting and other sports supplies it. Many of these activities are performed under arduous and unattractive conditions. Funds are short, equipment scanty, second-hand or borrowed. Yet the Wolfenden Committee discovered an increase in thirty-one of forty-three types of physical activity when it compared their numerical support with the pre-war figure. The majority of these are forms of sport fairly new to the British public and most of them are run by their players themselves, often by working-class people in self-governing groups.

It would have been astonishing if greater numbers of people had not been taking part in physical recreation than in the years before 1939. Little has been done to help them; they are still not very numerous and the most substantial increase in their numbers took place between 1945 and 1950.

The prospects for sport under Tory rule were never good. In view of the challenge facing British sport, they have never been so bad as they are today, following the latest cuts announced by Selwyn Lloyd. The Wolfenden Plan, already endorsed by 166 M.P.s, is tossed aside. Education is severely hit and the shortage of sports teachers aggravated. Local authorities are faced with a 7 per cent bank rate and the sacrifice of expenditure on many projects already approved, let alone quite fresh ones. The government's deliberate and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indefinite postponement of the Wolfenden Plan makes clear for all to see that nothing will be won for British sport without a most determined and sustained struggle.

It is natural to look first to the trade union movement as the leader of such a struggle, for trade unions came into being to further the all-round welfare of the working people. However, the trade union movement has recently shown little but indifference to the problems facing sport. The T.U.C. did not submit evidence to the Wolfenden Committee, though the Cambridge University Tiddlywinks Club did.

Centre 42 has been founded to assist the up-surge of the theatre and the arts now attracting the interest of trade unionists. Satisfaction would spread among British workers if the T.U.C. were to hail the New Year with a Centre 62 to help sport.

Such a decision could lead to a persistent and well-organised campaign to implement the Wolfenden Plan and other measures. It could do more; it could revive interest in sport among all the 185 trade unions affiliated to Congress. At the moment the Miners' galas, especially in Scotland and Wales, contain quite ambitious sporting programmes. Elsewhere the field is almost untouched. Trade union members are not actively encouraged to compete in sport or influence its running in a democratic manner, far less to make a distinctive contribution as trade unionists.

This indifferent attitude persists in spite of the fact that sporting competitions—including national tournaments—are quite frequently arranged by employers in whose other actions the trade unions show a continual interest.

New youth organisations should be set up in the Labour movement and existing ones greatly strengthened. The Co-operative Youth Movement (the only organisation of the Labour movement among the 200 which gave evidence to the Wolfenden Committee) is particularly well fitted to extend sporting activity among Co-op members and employees, and in this period of change within the Co-operative movement it should surely receive a large grant for this special purpose.

The Communist Party's Executive Committee discussed the subject of sport in July. Calling for a £100 million programme to finance sports centres throughout Britain, it put forward five proposals for immediate action:

1. *£10 million per year from the government, administered by an elected and representative central council.*
2. *Six acres of playing fields per 1,000 people, provided by local authorities.*
3. *Up-to-date sports facilities within easy reach of every school.*
4. *Annual sports festivals of at least the large trade unions.*
5. *Y.C.L. sports teams and sporting events in Communist Party social activities.*

These suggestions form a simple and clear programme. If a campaign is waged to put them into effect the policy of the Tories can be defeated.

Socialism

In *The British Road To Socialism* the Communist Party states: "A Socialist Government will . . . give every encouragement and material assistance to science, art, literature, music, drama, the cinema, sport and all other social activities that can help the all-round development of people and enrich their lives and leisure." It lays special stress on the prospect of local authorities' developing sports facilities of all kinds for our young people.

This type of all-round, lavish plan to build British sport is impossible under capitalism. Its system of profit, property relations and commercialism must be ended, and the fight for the future of sport and culture is a natural part of the struggle for social change.

That struggle has already been won over large parts of the earth. The impact upon sport has been gigantic. The mood of awe, mixed with a reluctance to think in unaccustomed political terms, was summed up by a leading British sports paper after the Rome Games, with its headline: "Copy Russians, or Forget Future Olympics."

Socialism liberates the talent and enthusiasm of a whole nation. The way to bring fresh honour to British sport is to unite the struggle for a new sports policy with the battle to create a new society in our country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Trade Unions and Coloured Workers

Bill Pinder

The Trade Union movement has been forthright in its condemnation of every manifestation of racial prejudice and discrimination. (T.U.C. Statement, Bournemouth, 1958.)

NOT only the T.U.C. but the Communist and Labour Parties are on record condemning race hatred and discrimination. There is hardly a trade union that has not expressed, at one time or another, determined opposition to colour bar and racial prejudice. In 1959, for example, the T.G.W.U., the Boilermakers, the A.E.S.D., N.U.F.T.O. and the N.U.R. all passed resolutions to this effect at annual conference, and looking at resolutions passed by individual trade union branches, we find an overwhelming rejection of racialist ideas. We should also note the powerful support given by the Trade Union movement to the Movement for Colonial Freedom and to such bodies as the Anti-Apartheid Committee and the London Inter-Racial Unity Committee.

All this is encouraging, because it shows how the foremost and most active sections of the British Trade Union movement are united in their desire to extend the hand of friendship to the immigrant workers from Africa and the West Indies, and in their determination to oppose segregation and the fostering of racial discord. A typical example of this was the resolution passed by a branch of a craft union, in the Birmingham area, which said:

> "The coloured people coming to England are British subjects only seeking a means of existence which is denied them in their place of birth. We implore all trade unionists to do all in their power to help them obtain employment and join their respective trade unions, thus enabling them to work and live as decent human beings."

However, within two months of that resolution, another was passed by a different branch of the same area, which read:

> "It is time a stop was put to all foreign labour entering this country, in the event of a slump occurring, the market would be flooded with cheap foreign labour and a serious deterrent to trade union bargaining power."

This second resolution contradicted the expressed attitude of this branch's national body and represented merely a minority opinion, but it does not stand alone, and there are others specifically directed at coloured workers. We should also note that in spite of the Labour Party's official declaration both Deptford and North Kensington Labour Parties have put forward policies favouring a restriction of immigration.

The N.U.R. set a lead when it called a London conference of white and coloured railwaymen to see how it could best help the immigrant workers in the industry. Yet there are large depots, both inside and outside of London, where a colour bar is being operated with the acceptance of the local union branches concerned. And the editor of the *Railway Review* saw fit to publish a letter from an anonymous signatory asserting that:

> "Today, in England, the blacks are being paid to breed and they are, to the extent that in a few years there will be 10 million in this island . . . those who are here are 80 per cent full of disease, T.B., etc."

as well as even wilder statements, all of which were patent falsehoods.

In a number of factories, bans on coloured workers have been imposed. As one engineering comrade has written: "In my factory a referendum by the shop steward to get a census of opinion on employing coloured labour was definitely against such employment." And it has to be recognised that these instances are something more than just the advocacy of discrimination: this is discrimination become active.

So far it is evident that as we pass from the national trade union bodies to local branches we find a certain difference opening up between stated national policy and the attitudes within the branches. It is also evident that, in spite of this difference, the great majority of expressed opinion within the Trade Union movement at all levels is in favour of a policy of friendship and integration. But the gap, nevertheless, exists, and reflects two things: the fact that in the branches and the factories the problem of jobs and wages is more directly felt and that many workers, because they are confused, quite genuinely feel immigrants to be a danger.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Secondly, that all national trade union bodies do not exert sufficient drive to combat this confusion among certain of the rank and file, and all too often confine themselves to a declaration of where they stand without attempting to carry all their members with them.

Rank and File Attitudes

To see the extent of the gap it is necessary to take into account what the rank and file members of our movement are thinking. A large part of our trade union membership does not attend trade union branches and a great many of our people are unwilling, except in moments of stress, to reveal just how much prejudice they may possess. This is often due to a certain feeling of guilt in harbouring bias and sometimes to an unwillingness to admit it to themselves. Therefore, to gauge as fully as possible their attitude on the question, we must take sharp note of what is said in the factory, in the streets and in the bars.

It is also important to see that we are at present concerned with the reaction of ordinary working-class people and their trade union organisations. We should note that every prejudiced person is not a fascist. The danger in not making this distinction is that it hinders unity and the possibility of winning people for a correct standpoint. This is well illustrated by a factory in North London, where a meeting of stewards was called to discuss the employment of coloured workers. The convenor, who did not favour such employment, was violently antagonised by a steward who declared that he was not going to sit down with a fascist. The convenor threatened to tear up his card, the meeting broke up in confusion, and no clarity was gained.

Mrs. Ruth Glass, in her recent book *The Newcomers*, notes that there are apparently few people in any social stratum in Britain who are genuinely free from prejudice: but she adds that there is, so far, only a minority who are dogmatic and self-righteous in demanding "Keep Britain White". If we are honest, this conclusion is not at odds with what we will find when talking to rank and file trade unionists and factory workers. Certainly if we speak to West Indians it is clear that they are meeting with a considerable amount of expressed prejudice and discrimination. There can be no doubt about this and we have to face up to it. At the same time, we should be wrong to draw the conclusion that the British working class is "one reactionary mass" on this question, as some people quite wrongly do. The fact that our movement overwhelmingly rejects colour bar and discrimination rules out such a conclusion. Moreover, the framing of such a policy of rejection has only been possible because large numbers of workers have participated in the meetings and discussions which have brought it about. But it is clear that all workers have not been so involved, and especially is this true of the unorganised sections of the working class.

The Source of Prejudice

That prejudice exists is not surprising, for what is it but the accumulation of false ideas of "white supremacy" and chauvinism resulting from nearly 200 years of capitalism; from bad education, imperialist ideology, fascist propaganda, cheap literature, sensational films, poverty and ignorance.

As Jack Woddis has written in his *Africa: The Roots of Revolt*: "The root and fruit of racial discrimination is profit!" Profit, that is, for the British capitalist class. A profit derived from low wages and inhuman conditions imposed upon colonial workers. Conditions which British workers are asked not to challenge because it is suggested that these people are, after all, "inferior" to themselves. Lord Robbins, of the British South Africa Company, was quoted in *The Times* as saying: "Why should it be supposed that a black African, just because he washes, speaks English, and wears European dress, must of necessity be accepted in the society of white men of the top grade?"

Racial prejudice becomes at once a justification for exploiting economically backward people in Africa and Asia, and a wedge to divide not merely the British workers from those in colonial and semi-colonial lands but an instrument for splitting the British working class itself. Prejudice and racialism is an essential part of imperialist ideology, constantly springs from it day by day, establishing a residual in people's minds, and it is upon this residual of prejudice that right-wing and fascist agitators play. No story is too far-fetched, no lie is too incredible, but that it will stick somewhere and add to the accumulation. There is no such thing as a "neutral mind". Every mind is a battleground and if working-class ideas are not to hand, capitalist ideas are readily available.

We should bear this in mind because not only do we have to combat capitalist ideas in others but in ourselves as well. One is reminded of the trade union branch secretary who agreed that he had "some darkies" in his branch. This was a man with a first-class record in the movement. His remark, however, was something more than a slip of the tongue. How would he regard these members if he had to fight an issue of bar-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ring coloured workers from the factory: as "darkies" or as part of the working class?

Recognising the extent of this residual we have to overcome it, and for two reasons:

1. Because the West Indian worker in Britain has the right to expect that our movement will do everything in its power to protect him, as it would any other worker.
2. Because if we do not overcome it the most serious consequences could beset our movement.

In examining the ideas we are called upon to combat, we find that people strongly disagree about the character of prejudice. The truth is that it takes many forms. Some refer to "xenophobia" and other biased conditions of the human mind, while there are those who note that a great deal of hostility to coloured people is due to economic reasons. But, whatever the distinction we make, none is more important than that between fighting actively and not fighting actively against whatever form of bias is expressed.

The Main Issues

It is clear that the main issues around which prejudice crystallises and becomes active are those of housing and jobs. In the course of a number of surveys carried out from June to November of 1958, it was found that whereas on such questions as having integrated schools, no discrimination in dance halls and pubs, or having coloured neighbours, definite objections were relatively low; there was a much higher proportion of objections in relation to "competition" for houses and jobs.

If the trade unionist were deeply hostile to coloured people, his hostility would extend beyond housing and jobs to the classroom, the dance hall and the pub. It is so far in a minority of cases that we find this happening, and Smethwick is an example, although considerably magnified in the press. But where this does occur it is rarely spontaneous. It is due to the activities of groups such as the "Keep Britain White Committee", the "Control of Immigration Committees" or the official fascist movement, whose efforts are devoted to stirring up the residual of ignorance and bias which is present to one degree or another in many ordinarily decent working-class folk. This prevents them from thinking clearly and makes it difficult for them to identify their real enemy.

That the strongest factor in hostility towards coloured workers is the anxiety of workers about homes and employment is also shown by the fact that such hostility can be extended to workers who are not coloured, to the Irish, for example, or the Welsh. In the case of Ireland these attitudes have an ancestry of some 700 years and have to be fought as we would fight other forms of bias. In local London papers, the Irishman is singled out just as the West Indian is, and a great deal of pressure needs to be exerted on those for whom the first thing of note about a law breaker, provided that he is not English, is his nationality.

Most actions towards excluding workers from the factory find their justification in the "economic threat" and are expressed largely in those terms. It is among those who have less experience of struggle and trade union organisation and little confidence in their own ability to fight the employer and the landlord that prejudice is more likely to assume its wilder and more violent forms. If other reasons were not enough, this underlines the need to extend the membership and influence and activity of our trade union movement among white and coloured workers alike. This is an aspect of things which received little attention in the T.U.C. statement of 1958.

We cannot overlook this fact that colour prejudice from being a passive thing, a background to active fears concerning the present and the future, can flare up and become an issue in itself and that we must adopt an uncompromising attitude towards it in its small manifestations as in its big ones.

The Fight Against Prejudice

But that there is a reluctance among sections of our movement to express opposition to prejudice is as certain as the fact of prejudice itself. Sometimes this stems from "tactical" reasons. A shop stewards' committee hesitated to recommend affiliation to a broad anti-colonial, anti-colour bar organisation because it was felt that "the workers might not understand". But with a period of explanation no doubt they would have done. Many others have.

There has been some doubt expressed as to whether we should answer fascist attacks in the press by letter. It has been feared that in so doing we might be giving recognition, or a platform, to the fascists. If we remain silent the fascists will not. Mosley held a meeting one year from the day of Kelso Cochrane's death and close by the spot where he was killed.

Then there is a feeling that we should not "elevate" those questions which may cut across unity being won on important issues of wages, housing, peace and German rearmament, and there have been cases of an unwillingness to mention the position of immigrant workers in election addresses. But what can come of unity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on this basis? The unity that will endure is that which seeks to unite all workers, both white and coloured, against every attack that may be made by the Tories, the fascists or their agents in our ranks—whatever form it may take.

Prejudice can be fought and a climate of opinion created which will discourage its expression. Clearly we are not, under capitalism, going to be able to wipe it out; we can go a long way towards isolating and exposing those who deliberately seek to foster it. As Mrs. Glass notes: "This prejudice, vacillating, uneasy and fed on misinformation, does not appear immutable." And the Communist Party, with its leaflets, articles and its forthcoming pamphlet, has given us a means of carrying this fight forward in the Trade Union movement. The fact that the recent resolution, aimed at limiting immigration, which was passed at a conference of London busmen, was reversed at a recall conference, shows what can be done when a fight is made. Events in Smethwick have also shown how a Labour Council, backed by the local Labour movement and religious organisations, can check unscrupulous attempts to set white against coloured on the issue of housing.

But, above all, what we need is legislation, because this would tremendously strengthen the hand of those who are against discrimination and weaken the hand of those who seek to use it as a weapon against us.

Again, as Mrs. Glass points out: "Discrimination is not institutionalised in British society. But, on the other hand, the prohibition of discrimination is not institutionalised either . . . it is because tolerance is so timid that prejudice is infectious." The Tories have resisted every attempt to introduce legislation that would make the practice and encouragement of discrimination illegal. The efforts of M.P.'s like Fenner Brockway, Ben Parkin and Sir Leslie Plummer to put such legislation on the statute book require the support of the whole Trade Union movement.

It is this lack of official disapproval that encourages the bully and the unscrupulous race hater. And that is why local organisations such as the Willesden International Friendship Association are important. They indicate to West Indians and Englishmen alike that the most influential, respectable and authoritative sections of the community are absolutely opposed to discrimination and the expression of race hatred. That is why our own individual attitudes and reactions are tremendously important in a cumulative way. The T.U.C., in its 1958 statement, laid great stress upon trade union organisations associating themselves with voluntary bodies of this kind. It also stressed the need to spread understanding and contact between white and coloured workers. Experience shows that prejudice is most operative among those who have not worked alongside coloured workers in the factory or had social contact with them.

Conditions under Capitalism

Much has been written about the number of West Indian immigrants coming to this country. In general, there appear to be no very precise figures and a number of contradictory percentages have been published and bandied about in discussion. But the issue is not one of how many or how few immigrants are coming here.

If conditions deteriorate it is ridiculous to suppose that by excluding immigrant workers we should be able to maintain even the standards we have now. A "recession" would make itself felt at the expense of the absolute mass of the working population. Those who experienced the 1930's know this well. Indeed, even today, increasingly large sections of our people are experiencing hardship.

And if there were no immigrants what consolation would this bring? More bad housing at steadily increasing rents, more rotten jobs with increasingly inadequate wages. Is this really the kind of perspective that anyone except the employers can hold out for our Labour movement?

The problem of jobs, of housing, of living is inherent in the system under which we live, and they grow more acute every day.

A system which allows the aristocracy and big businessmen to live in luxury on West Indian islands where there is mass unemployment, which forces West Indians to seek in Britain the work and education denied to them at home, while at the same time it increasingly denies to British workers any real happiness, security or hope for the future, is a rotten system that has to be swept away in the interests of British and West Indian workers alike. It is because of this that the two are allies and should not allow themselves to be divided by the bogus arguments of control of immigration.

It is interesting that many who propose control of immigration also propose an integrated Europe and a Common Market. Yet this would mean unrestricted movement of labour that would overshadow completely the present influx from the Commonwealth of which coloured workers are only a part.

In fact we must oppose the European Common Market as we must oppose control of immigration because neither of these steps is any solution to our problems.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We should also note that the proposal that we should impose quotas, or only admit those workers who already have a job, is to open the door to an extension of overseas recruitment and contract labour that could well lead precisely to the opposite of that which supporters of the idea imagine.

A medical examination is reasonable and the bulk of immigrants, whatever their colour, have nothing to fear from this. There could also be an improvement in reception facilities and some measures of protection extended to immigrants from the operations of unscrupulous landlords and estate agents, but this is not control of immigration.

The Class Issue

Finally, let us set our face against repeated attempts to divert attention from the ills of this system to the immigrants as the supposed authors of our misfortunes. Invariably the arguments are shallow and will not stand up to a "class" answer.

Frequently one hears immigrants blamed for the conditions in which they live. Notting Hill is an example. Yet, essentially, Notting Dale and Kensal New Town have not changed since Charles Booth described them in 1902. It is the system that has been responsible for this, not the immigrants. These are, in the main, the only type of area immediately open to them. Quite as frequently one hears the remark that West Indians, after all, are exploited by their own kind. But who are we exploited by? The fact is that we are all exploited and precisely what should unite us, more than the colour of our skins should divide us, is the fact that we are all exploited by capitalism, which ultimately has no loyalty, religion or interest other than of accumulating wealth at the expense of the happiness of the vast majority of human beings.

"What would happen in this country," asked Mr. Cyril Osborne, M.P., if the motor industry did not recover and the trade unions applied the principle of last in, first out? That would imply a colour bar and it would be inevitable." In fact, this would not be "colour bar," but the operation of an established trade union principle. The important thing is to abolish the cause of slumps. Let us rather ask what would happen if the grip of the monopolies upon our foreign trade, upon our means of production, upon our institutions and the machinery of government were broken? What would happen if the vast areas of Africa and the islands of the West Indies were to achieve their independence and full control of their economies and their immense natural wealth?

We could, in the words of Harry Pollitt, look forward to a future as different as day from night. "We see the great engineering factories of Britain ceasing to produce guns, tanks and planes, but instead sending locomotives, machine tools, electrical generators and motor cars. . . . " We would conduct trade on an equal basis of exchange, and give every assistance in our power to help the formerly economically backward countries to rebuild their economies. There need never be unemployment, redundancy or short time again in this country, and prosperity would be built equally on African, West Indian and British soil.

This is the answer to immigration that uproots workers and sends them thousands of miles to seek the work and education a rotten system has denied them. And this is the answer to all those urgent problems confronting us in this country. It is the answer that Tories like Osborne fear and why they will utilise every possible means to distract and confuse the growing unity of our Labour movement that is reaching inevitably towards this solution.

Discussion Contributions

Capitalism's Economic Prospects

Jack Dunman

THE Report of the Economic Committee gives a satisfactory answer to the questions put to it by our General Secretary. In the nature of things, the answer could not be a short one, but we now have all the factors set out clearly and comprehensively.

However, in the introduction it says: "For brevity's sake, this section (I) is confined to an analysis of the course of *industrial* [my italics] production in the major countries" (p. 198), and I wonder whether the Report would not have been still more valuable if *agricultural* production

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had been included in, or set out alongside, the figures for industrial production. This would not have greatly added to its length; and agriculture represents an important proportion of production in all the countries mentioned (lowest in Britain); and has some special features in its relation to capitalist crises.

In one passage in the Report the omission does seem to lead to some distortion; that is the paragraph on page 203, which refers to Western European as a "high-cost" agriculture. Stated baldly, and without qualification, it seems that this could give aid and comfort to those who, deriving their approach from nineteenth-century Liberal Free Traders, believe that agriculture in Britain and other advanced countries should be closed down and food obtained from countries which are "better" at producing it. The "high cost" referred to is caused partly by the fact that in Britain in particular, farmers and farm workers have been able, as a result of organisation, to obtain living standards considerably better than those in most other countries. There is also the fact that the monopolies, trading with a great mass of comparatively small agricultural producers, are able to obtain exceptionally high monopoly profits in supplying agricultural requirements and in purchasing agricultural products; and landlords draw their annual tribute in rent. These have an immediate effect on costs. None of these is a reason for closing down British agriculture, which, as regards the technique of production and results per acre (and still more per man), compares favourably with any other country in the world. What applies to Britain in relation to Europe applies also to Europe in relation to the colonial and ex-colonial countries.

Trade with Underdeveloped Countries

It has always been the policy of Socialists everywhere to oppose monopoly capitalism in its efforts to restrict and hold back agriculture in Britain and other industrial countries.

This links with another of the lines of thought developed in the document on pp. 203-4, but with too little emphasis; namely the question of conscious steps to increase world trade as a whole, and especially trade with the "under developed" countries. For those concerned with agriculture and food production, this has again a special significance and urgency, because this represents the only way in which they can avoid increasing difficulties and disasters.

Agricultural technique is advancing steadily and rapidly all along the front, and even capitalist countries achieve increases in the amount produced each year. Diets are not yet satisfactory for the whole population, even in such a country as Britain; especially in the more expensive foods needed for health.[1] But consumption does not increase automatically, as food comes on the market, even if prices are reduced. For this reason, agricultural producers in a number of capitalist countries, organised in the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (I.F.A.P.), have recently issued a long statement calling for more trade with underdeveloped countries, with much of which Marxists must agree.

It seems to me that we should make much more of this demand; which if it does fit in with the interests of capitalist and peasant farmers, also expresses the needs of the workers of the capitalist countries as being the road to avoiding, or at least mitigating, the tendency of capitalism to produce crises and unemployment.

Certainly it is in line with the fight for peaceful co-existence, and it might well prove to be the first and easiest fruits of peaceful co-existence in the economic field.

Looked at in another way, it is the only answer (short of socialism) to the European Common Market-Outer Seven problem, which, let us face it, cannot be solved simply by the extension of East-West trade, but necessitates a massive freeing of *world* trade.

I have heard it argued that it is utopian to put this concept forward, as being impossible before the achievement of socialism. I cannot see that it is any more utopian than to demand disarmament, while capitalism exists, which we do, and to which we devote a great deal of our campaigning. The demand for increased trade with the underdeveloped countries is as vital and essential a demand in the field of economics as disarmament is in the field of politics.

East-West Co-operation

The kind of development which we should advocate has nothing in common with the "aid" which the U.S.A. is seeking to dole out, which includes more strings than aid, which is designed to give American monopolies increasing control of the recipients, and which provides convenient dumping grounds for embarrassing U.S. surpluses. The socialist countries are already giving the right type of assistance; the aim, and it is a perfectly feasible campaigning aim, should be East-West co-operation, to organise and extend it. It is feasible precisely because many Western industrialists and capitalists, as well as farmers, realise its necessity *for their own salvation*.

Such arrangements would first and foremost need credits of a very long term. The countries

[1] See Report on Domestic Food Consumption 1959.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most requiring development have only primary products to export in return for industrial development, and vast increases of these cannot necessarily be quickly absorbed by the industrial countries, without increasing the difficulties of their own economies.

On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that the countries most requiring capital aid for industrial development are in the main those whose people have the worst diets. One of the effects of long-term credits should be to allow them to retain as much of their home-produced food as they can use. In fact, it might very well go much further than that. As these countries are deficient in the most expensive foods, especially protein, the more advanced countries might well find a use for their own (alleged) surpluses by exporting certain foods to the traditionally food-exporting countries. To take an extreme, but by no means fantastic example; some of the "surplus" milk which is embarrassing the Government in Britain (and which is being deliberately discouraged by unpopular measures) might very well be made into our excellent English cheeses and be sent to countries seriously deficient in protein.

These are some of the questions opened up by this very stimulating document. Can we hope to have another, or a supplementary one, in which the question of food production throughout the world, and in Britain is integrated in the whole treatment?

Can we also have—and this is urgent—a real drive to defeat the strangulation of world trade by bogus Common Markets, Outer Sevens and what not, by a campaign for world trade, with all the necessary arrangements for bringing in *all* countries, especially those requiring long term help to build up their economies. There are plenty of capitalists who see this as their only hope of survival; we should see it not only as the best way of fighting against immediate threats but as a big step in the inevitable advance to world socialism.

Stages of Social Development

Jack Lindsay

I SHOULD like to support the note by Robin Jardine on this subject in the July issue. There seems no evidence whatever that China passed through a stage of slave society; it follows, then, that one cannot even use the term "feudal" for her development if one means by it the same thing as the medieval society of Europe which emerged from the breakdown of ancient slave society. Similarly one needs terms based on the facts to define the societies of the Near East emerging from tribal society in the first settled days of agriculture and urban life, when there was not a slave society in the sense that we apply that term to the Graeco-Roman world.

The importance of this latter point in relation to China comes from the fact that China never developed beyond this primary stage of urbanisation in the Neolithic and Bronze Ages. The discovery of iron-working, which seems to have come in late, did not have the revolutionary effect there that it had in the Mediterranean and European world. What occurred was a remarkable expansion and refinement on the Bronze Age bases. The fact that the script of the bone-oracles of the second millennium B.C. holds the basic ingredients of what has ever since been Chinese script, is the outstanding example of this standing-still together with immense refinement on the given bases. It is as though we in Europe were still using an elaborated version of Mesopotamian cuneiform. Two useful discussions are to be found in Needham's essay in *Mainstream*, July 1960, and Wu Ta-K'un's in *Past and Present* No. I (1952).

There is nothing surprising in the fact that the main stages leading on to capitalism occurred only in the complex made up of the Near East and Europe; nothing that contradicts Marxism in the fact that other large tracts remained stranded for various social, economic and political reasons at points along the way. What does contradict Marxism however is to attempt to force the latter into a given framework. The crucial matter is the state and society of the Bronze Age; for if we can define that correctly we have the basis to proceed with understanding what happened in China. It would indeed be remarkable if the enormous discoveries in anthropology, prehistory, and early history since Marx and Engels wrote, did not considerably change our ideas.

Published by the Communist Party, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2, and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.) Aldenham, Herts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE SCHOOL

ON

"BRITAIN AND THE COMMON MARKET"

"OAKHURST", HASTINGS

October 6th to 8th, 1961

There will be lectures and full discussion of the economic implications following the decision of the British government to apply for membership to the Common Market.

Lecturers will include:

J. R. Campbell and Leonard Thomas

Cost: £2 12s. 6d. per head. (Friday evening to Sunday tea-time.)

Full details and application forms can be obtained from THE CENTRAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, The Communist Party, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2.

The Editorial Board of

MARXISM TODAY

would welcome comments on the general contents of the journal and suggestions for future articles.

Send to Editor,

MARXISM TODAY

16, King Street, London, W.C.2

by September 27th.

Profits, Wages and Wealth

Alan Brown

The latest addition to the Socialism Today series; a lively account of how exploitation works in present-day Britain

3s. 6d.

Right Wing Labour

Its Theory and Practice

Emile Burns

Showing where various lines of "new thinking" do in fact lead

7s. 6d.

Africa, the Lion Awakes

Jack Woddis

In this companion volume to *Africa, the Roots of Revolt* the author reviews the political scene in the various African territories

21s.

Ten Days That Shook the World

John Reed

This world-famous eye-witness account of the Russian Revolution has long been out of print in this country

15s.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the proper study of mankind . . .

THE ORIGIN OF MAN

MIKHAIL NESTURKH

Scientific study of the origin of Homo sapiens, the significance of his functions and his divergent development

illustrated **30s**

ANCIENT SOCIETY

LEWIS MORGAN

Unobtainable for years, this immense work on the structure of primitive society is once more in print

17s 6d

ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE USSR

ALEXANDER MONGAIT

This beautifully produced volume describes Soviet archaeological research into human history from the Stone Age to the sixteenth century

illustrated **45s**

Central Books
37 Grays Inn Rd
London WC1

new catalogue available on request

Collet's Column—No. 8

Thursday evenings at 64

It is over two years since Collet's old 'Bomb Shop' in Charing Cross Road was enlarged and completely renovated. Since then a steadily growing number of customers has been welcomed to the shop.

The unique range of new and out-of-print books, pamphlets and journals on politics, economics, history, philosophy and literature have made it a Mecca for all who want progressive reading. In a single day recently visitors came to the shop from Venezuela, Nigeria, Argentina, Cuba, U.S.A., Soviet Union, China, Ghana, Australia, South Africa, Czechoslovakia, Israel, and Iraq.

Perhaps you already know the shop and go there to pick up the latest pamphlets on Africa, or a Penguin for the weekend, when you buy your *Marxism Today*. But did you know that the normal opening hours of 9.30 to 6.00 are extended to 8.00 on Thursdays? Many customers in fact now make Thursday night a regular call. You will be very welcome too.

Collet's

64-66 CHARING CROSS ROAD
W.C.2

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED